

AMERICA

A·CATHOLIC·REVIEW·OF·THE·WEEK

VOL. XXV. No. 20 }
WHOLE No. 623 }

September 3, 1921

{ \$4.00 A YEAR
{ PRICE 10 CENTS

CONTENTS

	PAGE
CHRONICLE	459-462
TOPICS OF INTEREST	
The Riddle of Russia—Great Britain and the United States—Dante and Mahomet—For the Land of Columbus—Normal Religion	463-470
COMMUNICATIONS	470-471
EDITORIALS	
No Time for God—In Contempt of the Law—The Imperial Wizard Unmasks—Our "Model" Divorce Laws—Magistrate McQuade and Congress	472-474
LITERATURE	
Our Literature and Our Life—Nature's Warning—Reviews—Books and Authors—Books Received	474-478
EDUCATION	
Your Child and the Catholic School	479-480
ECONOMICS	
The "Civilizing" Motor-Car	480-481
NOTE AND COMMENT	481-482

Chronicle

Home News.—The treaty of peace between the United States and Germany was signed at Berlin on August 25, by Ellis Loring Dresel, American Commissioner, on behalf of President Harding, and by Dr. Frederick Rosen, Foreign Minister, on behalf of Germany. The treaty will not go into effect until ratifications have been exchanged, but it is expected that it will receive the approval both of the Senate and the Reichstag. Both these bodies are now in recess but will reconvene in the latter part of September.

Treaty with Germany

The treaty provides that the United States shall have all the rights and advantages specified in the resolution of peace signed by the President on July 2, and also all the rights and advantages specified for the benefit of the United States in the Treaty of Versailles. By the terms of the treaty just signed the United States, therefore, is confirmed in her rights with respect to the German overseas possessions, including the Island of Yap, which were renounced by Germany in favor of the principal Allied and Associated Powers, and is put on an equal footing with the other Allies and Associated Powers with respect to the military clauses, the reparation, the financial and economic clauses of the Versailles Treaty, and the parts of that treaty referring to aerial

navigation, ports, waterways and railways, guarantees and miscellaneous provisions. The treaty also declares that the United States shall not be bound by any of the provisions of the Versailles Treaty which refer to the League of Nations, nor by the stipulations regarding the boundaries of Germany, the political clauses that concern Europe, the provisions concerning China, Siam, Liberia, Morocco, Egypt, Turkey, Bulgaria and Shantung. Further the treaty provides that while the United States is privileged to participate in the reparation or in any other commission established under the Versailles Treaty or under any agreement supplemental thereto, this country is not bound to participate in any such commission unless it shall elect to do so.

Panama, on August 23, ordered its citizens to evacuate, as soon as possible, the strip of land which for many years has been in dispute between Costa Rica and Panama, and that its contemplated occupation by Costa Rica should not be forcibly resisted. This

The Panama Question

action came as the ultimate result of the demand, made by Costa Rica some weeks before, that it should be allowed to take possession of the disputed territory. Panama prepared to resist, but at the same time notified the United States that forcible resistance would not be offered if the United States forbade hostilities. Panama also requested the United States to suggest to Costa Rica that it should delay taking over jurisdiction of the disputed territory. To this note Secretary Hughes replied that the United States saw no reason to make such a suggestion to Costa Rica. This country believed that the arbitral awards of President Loubet of France and of Chief Justice White of the United States should be carried out, and that Costa Rica was justified in taking over immediately the territory hitherto occupied by Panama on sufferance. A battalion of American marines was then dispatched to the Canal Zone. On the receipt of the Secretary's note Panama issued the evacuation order, and told Narcisco Garay, Foreign Minister for Panama, who had been in Washington conducting negotiations, to leave the United States after filing a protest. Dr. Garay in his note deplored the fact that force still rules the world and that the rights of peoples are recognized only in so far as they have the power to enforce them by warfare. To this sharp communication Mr. Hughes replied, on August 26, that the United States has found no escape from the conclusion that the

Governments of Panama and Costa Rica, having engaged, in the most solemn manner, to abide by the arbitral award of Chief Justice White, are bound by that award. The United States had given full consideration to every side of the controversy, and the statements of Dr. Garay required no further comment.

Panama, however, has raised a new point of issue. According to the Porras-Anderson Treaty, a commission was to be appointed for laying out the boundary between Panama and Costa Rica. One of the provisions of the treaty declares that one commissioner should be named by Costa Rica, one by Panama, and two by the American Chief Justice. Costa Rica has appointed a commissioner, Chief Justice Taft has appointed two commissioners, but Panama, it is reported, has refused to appoint one, and in addition has refused to recognize the validity of the appointments made by Mr. Taft. Panama's action is based on the ground, that having rejected the White award, the arbitration agreement entered into before that award does not exist. No official notification, however, of this refusal has been received at Washington.

France.—The financial situation of the country is thus summarized by Mr. Sisley Huddleston in a recent issue of the *Living Age*. According to the writer, France must

The Financial Situation find this year 54,000,000,000 francs, but it is well-nigh impossible for her to raise in taxes more than 20,000,000,000 francs. An extraordinary budget of over 3,000,000,000 is not balanced even on paper, while the special budget amounts to over 15,000,000,000 nominally recoverable from Germany. The public debt amounts to over 3,000,000,000 francs. It is expected that this year subscription to government bonds will largely cover the deficit, and something moreover may be recovered from Germany. But it is evident that the country cannot live on loans for any considerable length of time. They must be consolidated and there must be some amortization. The Government just now seems to be inclined to launch a big consolidation loan in the autumn. It also intends to cut down expenditures, to stimulate the collection of taxes, notoriously inadequate, and not to impose fresh taxes unless they are shown to be absolutely necessary. It may be possible by strenuous efforts to balance the ordinary budget.

Pension and reconstruction budgets call for about 12,000,000,000 francs annually for eight years. With regard to these, Senator Chéron calculates that at the best five or six billions must be raised by loan every year, after Germany's contributions are reckoned. It might of course be possible to negotiate the German bonds and thus to realize a capital sum upon them. But public sentiment seems to be against the selling of these bonds by the Reparations Commission. They could be absorbed by the money markets of the world only to a limited extent, and it is probable that enormous discounts would

be demanded. France seems to be inclined to hold them and to recover the interest and amortization funds from Germany each year. An alternative scheme however is proposed, that of issuing them with an Allied guaranty, a sort of international loan. Of these bonds only the first 50,000,000,000 bear interest for the present; this is precisely the sum offered by Germany. The remaining 82,000,000,000 will be scraps of paper of doubtful value.

According to the London *Morning Post* the disasters which befell the *Banque Industrielle de Chine* and the *Société Centrale des Banques de France* amounted to 230,000,000,000 francs for their shareholders. *L'Humanité*, a Socialist organ whose reports must not be accepted unconditionally, states that the funds of these institutions were gambled away in speculations, especially in rice and silk. According to this journal, France is thus witnessing "the premonitory shocks which precede bankruptcy." Mr. Huddleston states that there may be more Socialist theory than business judgment in these prognostications.

According to the chairman of the French deputation of the Congress of the International Chambers of Commerce in London, the number of unemployed in France is about 200,000, not a high figure when compared with the number in other European countries. It is estimated that more than 50,000 industrial laborers returned to agriculture this year. Within twelve months the country has increased its output of iron more than forty per cent. Agricultural production, which fell off during the war one-half, now nearly suffices for home consumption. During the first four months of 1921, imports of manufactured goods, exclusive of raw materials and food, fell from 3,500,000,000 francs to less than 2,000,000,000 francs, while exports of manufactured goods rose from 3,900,000,000 to 4,500,000,000 francs. But this has not materially increased the value of the franc owing to the heavy foreign debts of the country, to speculation and to inflation.

Germany.—Mathias Erzberger, formerly Vice-Chancellor and Minister of Finance, and signer of the armistice in behalf of Germany in 1918, was assassinated by two unknown youths while walking through the Black Forest near Offenburg, Baden, on August 26. The murderers escaped, although a reward of 100,000 marks has been offered by President Ebert for their capture or any information leading to their arrest. The murder is said to be but one of nearly 300 similar cases ascribed to the tactics of political reactionaries. Erzberger was born in 1875, the son of a poor tailor. He became a schoolmaster, secured for himself a university education, studied international law and political economy, and became in time one of the foremost leaders of the Centrist party. A year before the armistice he proposed a resolution in the Reichstag favoring a peace without annexation, the payment of an indemnity by the German Em-

Assassination of Mathias Erzberger

pire, and the return by the Allies of the German colonies. Chancellor Bethman-Hollweg declared this unacceptable and Dr. Karl Helfferich, when Vice-Chancellor, even accused him of high treason. Erzberger sued him for libel, and during the course of the trial was accused of having enriched himself in the war. While leaving the criminal court building, on January 26, 1920, the first attempt was made upon his life by a youth named Hirschfeld, a former cadet officer. Erzberger stood out as the most notable character during the past few years and "the best hated man" in Germany. The *New York Herald* says of him:

Herr Erzberger was unpopular in Germany because he was prominent in concluding the armistice negotiations, which the Nationalists declared he made unnecessarily humiliating to Germany. He was hated by seafaring Germans because he complied with the allied demands in connection with the German merchant marine. He was hated by the military because he participated in the dissolution of the old army. Also he was unpopular with the Prussian Protestants because he represented the Liberal South German Catholic movement. Finally, he was unpopular because his financial program involved thorough reform and capital sacrifice.

He was the power behind the throne of the Wirth Cabinet and inspired the present Wirth financial program. His grasp of the German financial situation was such that even his worst enemies admitted he probably would return to power in the near future. His conciliatory attitude in meeting outside demands, combined with his financial astuteness, won for him the title of "Germany's Caillaux."

If reactionaries and their newspapers continue the tactics that have led to the murder of Erzberger, Chancellor Wirth declares, the German Government will resign. "We will ask the people whether they desire a responsible Government or a murder regime." Before a meeting of party leaders President Loebe of the German Reichstag stated: "The crime was undoubtedly a political murder. It may well have serious consequences." Erzberger has rightly been described as the stormy petrel of Germany, and even the Catholics were in recent years divided in regard to him. He had retired into comparative obscurity for a short time, but was fast returning to power and his moderate program dominated the present Government.

Ireland.—On August 26 Mr. De Valera forwarded to Mr. Lloyd George Dail's answer to Britain's offer to Ireland. The document, which is a clear and concise reassertion of the principles on which our own Government is based, is as follows:

*Irish
Correspondence*

The anticipatory judgment I gave in my reply of August 10 has been confirmed. I laid the proposals of your Government before the Dail Eireann, and by a unanimous vote it has rejected them.

From your letter of August 13 it was clear that the principle we are asked to accept was that the "geographical propinquity" of Ireland to Great Britain imposed the condition of the subordination of Ireland's right to Great Britain's strategic interests, as she conceived them, and that the very length and persistence of the efforts made in the past to compel Ireland's acquiescence

in a foreign domination imposed the condition of acceptance of that domination now.

We cannot believe that your Government intended to commit itself to the principle of sheer militarism, destructive of international morality and fatal to the world's peace. If a small nation's right to independence is forfeit when a more powerful neighbor covets its territory for military or other advantages it is supposed to confer, there is an end to liberty. No longer can any small nation claim the right to a separate existence. Holland and Denmark can be made subservient to Germany, Belgium to Germany or to France, Portugal to Spain.

If nations that have been forcibly annexed to an empire lose thereby their title to independence, there can be for them no rebirth to freedom.

In Ireland's case, to speak of her seceding from a partnership she has not accepted or from an allegiance which she has not undertaken to render is fundamentally false, just as the claim to subordinate her independence to British strategy is fundamentally unjust. To neither can we, as representatives of the nation, lend countenance.

If our refusal to betray our nation's honor and the trust that has been reposed in us is to be made an issue of war by Great Britain, we deplore it. We are as conscious of our responsibilities to the living as we are mindful of principle or of our obligations to the heroic dead.

We have not sought war nor do we seek war, but if war be made upon us we must defend ourselves, and shall do so, confident that, whether our defense be successful or unsuccessful, no body of representative Irishmen or Irishwomen will ever propose to the nation the surrender of its birthright.

We long to end the conflict between Great Britain and Ireland. If your Government be determined to impose its will upon us by force, and antecedent to negotiations to insist upon conditions that involve a surrender of our whole national position and make negotiation a mockery, the responsibility for the continuance of the conflict rests upon you.

On the basis of the broad guiding principle of government by the consent of the governed peace can be secured—a peace that will be just and honorable to all and fruitful of concord and inducing to amity.

To negotiate such a peace the Dail Eireann is ready to appoint its representatives, and, if your Government accepts the principle proposed, to invest them with plenary powers to meet and arrange with you for its application in detail. I am, sir, faithfully yours.

EAMON DE VALERA.

In his answer Lloyd George expressed regret over Dail's answer, for he and his colleagues had gone to the very length of their power in the Irish offer. Proceeding, the Premier declares:

You declare our proposals involve the surrender of Ireland's whole national tradition and reduce her to subservience. What are the facts? Under the settlement we outlined Ireland would control every nerve and fiber of her national existence. She would speak her own language and make her own religious life; she would have complete power over taxation and finance, subject only to an agreement for keeping trade and transport as free as possible between herself and Great Britain, her best market. She would have uncontrolled authority over education and all the moral and spiritual interests of her race; she would have it also over law and order, over land and agriculture, over conditions of labor and industry, over the health and homes of her people, and over her own defense. She would, in fact, within the shores of Ireland be free in every respect of national activity, national expression and national development. The States of the American Union, sovereign though they be, enjoy no such range of rights. Our proposals go even further, for they invite Ireland to take her place as a partner in the great commonwealth of free

nations, united by allegiance to the King. We consider these proposals completely fulfil your wish that the principle of government by consent of the governed should be the broad and guiding principle of the settlement which your plenipotentiaries are to negotiate. That principle was first developed in England and is the mainspring of the representative institutions which she was first to create. It was spread by her throughout the world and is now the very life of the British Commonwealth. We could not have invited the Irish people to take their place in that Commonwealth on any other principle, and we are convinced that through it we can heal old misunderstandings and achieve an enduring partnership as honorable to Ireland as to the other nations of which the Commonwealth consists. But when you argue that the relations of Ireland with the British Empire are comparable in principle to those of Holland or Belgium with the German people, I find it necessary to repeat once more that those are premises which no British Government, whatever its complexion, can ever accept.

After quoting the demands of former Irish leaders or sympathizers, the Premier states:

There is no political principle, however clear, that can be applied without regard to limitations imposed by physical and historical facts. Those limitations are as necessary as the very principle itself to the structure of every free nation; to deny them would involve the dissolution of all democratic States. It was on these elementary grounds that we called attention to the governing force of the geographical propinquity of these two Islands and of their long and historic association, despite the great difference of character of the races.

We do not believe a permanent reconciliation between Great Britain and Ireland can ever be attained without recognition of their physical and historical interdependence, which makes complete political and economic separation impracticable for both.

There follows an inept and wholly inapplicable analogy between the present relations of Great Britain and Ireland and the secession of the Southern States. In conclusion Lloyd George declares that he cannot prolong a mere exchange of notes. The document clearly shows that expediency, not principle, is guiding the Premier and that he considers Parliament and the Crown, not God, the originator and donor of human liberty.

British papers did not take kindly to De Valera's reply.

The *Daily Mail* says: "We do not pretend to follow the line of argument De Valera has taken."

The *Daily Express* declares De Valera's letter neither opens wider nor shuts closer the door to an Irish settlement. "Real progress will be made with the peace negotiations, when the time comes for De Valera to descend to earth and to bring his Cabinet and Parliament with him."

The *Daily News* thinks De Valera's reply defiant and provocative, but it is not a declaration of war, and Lloyd George's reply makes a continuation of negotiations possible.

The *Chronicle* expresses itself as not in the least satisfied that Ireland has rejected the Government's offer, if the Dail has done so. It cannot believe that if the Irish people were given full power to decide they would vote for rejection. "We have greater faith in the sanity and wisdom of the Irish people."

The *Daily Telegraph* believes:

De Valera's letter is an exercise in rhetoric less vehement than what has gone before, but not the less far removed from the tone of practical discussion to which sooner or later the Sinn Fein leadership must subdue itself if there is to be anything worth calling negotiation.

The *Morning Post*, always violent, asserts:

If Lloyd George desires to treat with the Irish people, why does he not deal with the real representatives of the South and West? We have sufficient evidence to prove that no more than a small proportion of the Irish people are actually adherents of the Sinn Fein. Where are Mr. Dillon, Mr. Devlin and the remnant of the Nationalist party? In the House of Commons have they been consulted? No one can describe these gentlemen as particularly friendly to England, but at least they own a real title to represent a part of the Irish people. Where are the Irish Unionists? In a word, what conceivable justification can the Prime Minister produce for settling the destinies of Ireland with the gang of conspirators which is holding down the country, reducing it to a condition of terror and lawlessness, reflecting a black disgrace upon the Government?

The *London Times* says:

We urge Irishmen not to be misled by the vain belief that the Government will make any further concessions. Englishmen do, indeed, most earnestly desire that this age-long controversy should be brought to an honorable conclusion, and they are prepared to make real sacrifices to attain this object, but there is a limit beyond which they cannot and will not go. If the leaders of the Sinn Fein are wise, they will realize that the moment at which the reiteration of the differences between the English and Irish point of view might possibly serve a useful purpose has been passed.

On August 27, Lloyd George said at Barnsley:

I am a believer in Providence. The common sense, steadiness and calm courage shown during the war will pull us through. Keep up your courage, and the world will come right. For God's sake, let us clear aside the prejudices so far as Ireland is concerned! I have never seen a man with a vendetta I would trust with any job. Hatred is sour pasture. There is no strength in it and no nourishment. No nation can flourish in a swamp of hatred. I am proud that Britain has risen above all prejudices and proposed terms such as have never been proposed before. They are terms which commend themselves not only to Britain, but to the whole of the civilized world. It is difficult at this juncture to say anything that can be of any use, and whatever our views are we cannot countenance separation. We can no more countenance the tearing up of the United Kingdom than America could countenance the tearing up of the United States. Severance would lead in Ireland itself to civil war. We cannot witness a civil war at our own door, if Southern Ireland is not satisfied with freedom, but insists upon separation, then I fear all hope of accommodation must be abandoned. I trust common sense will prevail and that good counsels will be heeded. We only want to do what is fair, right and just. If Ireland has the right to separation, so has Scotland and so has Wales, but no Welsh or Scotch patriot would ever dream of demanding separation. I believe that when the Irish people realize that the essence of freedom is theirs, that real freedom is offered to them and that all they are asked to do is to come into the proudest community of nations in the world as free men, I believe you will find that gifted people will realize that their destiny is greater as a free people inside a free federation of peoples.

From all this it appears that both the Irish and English expect further negotiation.

The Riddle of Russia

E. CHRISTITCH

FAMINE overtakes Russia while she is still in the chaotic state produced by horror succeeding to horror, by violent changes that meant change only and not improvement. Superficial observers ask themselves in despair how could a great Christian people have let these things come to pass? They forget that the sudden elimination of an evil, such as the autocratic regime of Russia, could not result in an immediate substitution of good. In politics as in nature there are no swift transformations though there may be cataclysms. Blind and mad innovators, bent on repairing in a day abuses that were the growth of centuries have envenomed and augmented them. The one consoling feature of Russia's revolution is that the fanatic *intelligensia* hewing the inert masses with a pick-axe, have made but few and slight breaches. Anybody but such cold, relentless enthusiasts as Trotzky and Lenin would have given up the task of converting the Russian people to Communist theories after the failure of the last years; but these impotent despots are still holding on.

Why do the law-abiding, virtuous, religious people of Russia support all this time an obligarchy forcibly seeking to inculcate ideas and methods foreign to their slow line of thought? Precisely because the Russian peasant is patience personified in the present as he has been in the past. It took more than a decade for France to create a semblance of order after she overthrew her monarchy. Russia requires more time than France to gather herself together before she moves forth, once again to assert her status in the circle of the nations. At present the real Russia is mute, and what we hear and see is but a series of paradoxes. As in former days, the vast majority of the population remains unaffected by its nominal rulers, the system of local administrative government being here more potent than in any country on earth. This explains the comparative indifference of the *mujiks* to the antics of the governing cliques at St. Petersburg and Moscow. When pressure comes nearer home there is revolt and terrible vengeance. If the Communist dictators have not already been swept aside in a sea of blood, it is because they recognize what they sought to deny, the people's opposition. They are now proceeding carefully, concentrating their "reforms" in certain districts where they have a strong military preponderance, and leaving other territories untouched. The *mujik* refuses to obey in the things that matter most to his simple mind. He will not give up his beloved scrap of soil for any Communist theory, and he will worship God as he is wont. Lenin's determination had to give way as far as religion is concerned. Primitive races are fierce. The Commissars who insulted the Most High wiped out the insult in their blood. "The Faith and the land are ours," said the Russian folk of the plains and the steppes, "and whoso interferes with either shall not live in Russia."

The Bolsheviks, who claim to be molding a nation, have in reality affected only a few oases dotted in the great tract between the sunny seas of the South and the frozen Polar expanse. Even in the cities religious processions again parade the streets praying for Heaven's help in the general distress. Bolshevik onlookers were compelled to remove their hats as the ikons were borne past. Armored cars sent to disperse the crowds were powerless, and blasphemous patrols were seized or trampled to death. The Central Committee of Moscow Bolsheviks issued a circular warning its adherents against their continued disregard for paragraph 13 of its program, which obliges them to active anti-religious propaganda. "Not only is there negligence," says the circular, "but open defiance of the rule, even so far as actual participation in stupid rites, instead of the campaign of enlightenment, on which the Committee rightfully counted to wean the peasants from their superstitions."

According to Krasikov, the religious revival has attained such dimensions as make it today the most formidable enemy of the Bolsheviks. In substituting the State for God, Lenin has not succeeded in deceiving the Russian peasant. Ivan is conscious that the State is composed of fallible beings, himself included, born to evil, victim of an imperfect nature. The State as his final ideal is unacceptable to one persuaded that his existence does not terminate in dust. The State can never be for him omnipotent, all-righteous, the center of his aspirations, the absolute controller of his being. Ivan will cling to his faith, and still regard it as his highest mentor. He may co-operate with the State, but he will not subordinate his soul to its unauthorized dictates. We know, in spite of the efforts to conceal it, how profoundly modified is the original Communist plan of reconstruction. It took centuries to consolidate imperial Russia into the semblance of a State, and reconstruction on totally different lines is not accomplished by a trick of the thumb. The first and most vital problem in Russia is the religious problem for all who would guide or influence the destinies of the people. Strong in this knowledge, the Patriarch Tihon was not cowed by the Communist war on religion, and well foresaw his own eventual triumph in the restoration of Church services and the tolerance of religious education. Not that the Orthodox Church in itself has regained its pristine power. The blow it received by the downfall of autocracy can never be remedied. But religion is no longer persecuted; and even the communities of nuns proclaimed and dispersed, on paper, have been authorized to reassemble in their former domiciles. The decree is in most cases merely a recognition of their uninterrupted status of seclusion. For, in face of the menacing attitude of the people, Bolshevik emissaries frequently found it wise to refrain from enforcing the laws

against monastic freedom and cultural celebrations. The schemes for abolishing religion have fallen flat.

But though the revolution has shown that religion is ineradicable from the hearts of the Russian people, it has also shown that attachment to the State Church was mainly confined to the educated classes. Peasants and workers in their yearning for God managed to do without the trappings and rulings of their State Church when they were reduced to it. They kept their holy emblems and their right to prayer in common, and they rejoiced in Mass when they could get a priest, but their adherence to the authority of the State Church was vague. The religious revival is not directed by the Hierarchy, but is the spontaneous action of the masses, long accustomed to seek for themselves what official Orthodoxy could not offer. Had the Russian Church been equal to its task, of course, Communism could not have won even its present superficial hold on sections of the people. In reality the new doctrines made headway only among the sects, although here, too, they have been repudiated in many instances, and sometimes they aroused a desire for reconciliation with Orthodoxy. If laymen occupy the positions formerly reserved to priests it is due to more freedom, not in thought, but in practices of worship, and also to the dearth of clergy through martyrdom or banishment. During the initial persecution by the Bolsheviks, the Russian Church regained some lost ground. Voluntary offerings in reparation for acts of profanity were so munificent that religious ceremonies are being carried out in particular districts with the splendor of pre-revolution days. The devout Russian will tighten his belt and forego many a meal to contribute a candle before the high altar. But in the main the religious revival is not affiliated to or inspired by that once puissant temporal power known as the State Church of Russia. Lenin realized his folly in attacking it as the source of Christian belief when he found the peasants conducting their own services with redoubled fervor without recourse to the spiritual authorities formerly their nominal heads. In the great Putilov factory, where hundreds of workers had been persuaded to resume work, ikons were at once installed and hours fixed for prayer. The Bolshevik supervisors shut their eyes to this infringement of rules and managed to be absent when hymns made the walls resound. They were faced by the truth of what the anarchist, Kropatkin, wrote in despair, that no human power and no system of philosophy will ever remove Christ from the Russian heart. Left to himself, the first care of the *mujik* is his soul, and his body is voluntarily doomed to hardship, often even mutilation, lest it should hamper the upward trend of the soul. The faith of the people is still a very living faith. Still they proclaim from the pulpits after the solemn recitation of the Creed: "This is the Faith of the Apostles! This is the Faith of our Fathers! This is the Orthodox Faith! This is the universal Faith! This Faith is ours!" Still is the terrible "Anathema!" hurled during the first week of Lent at all heretics, from

Arius to Tolstoi, although the Bishops may alter or omit some of the penalties or the names: "Cursed be the enemies of the Church of Christ! Cursed the Mahometans! Cursed the contemners of the Feast of the Annunciation! Cursed the oppressors of widows and orphans! Cursed the deniers of the Orthodox Faith!" And formerly it ran: "Cursed the rebels against the Lord's Anointed, the Orthodox Tsar! Cursed the blasphemers, the scoffers at Holy Ikons!" And the shuddering congregation answers in a deep wail: "Anathema!"

The formula was continued with bated breath between church walls, whose doors were closed to the Bolshevik commissaries, long after the Reds had announced to the world that they governed Russia, a myth no longer maintained. Russia is slowly transforming the Red Government and bringing it into line with Russian mentality. What will emerge from the maelstrom of religious aspirations with which Russia is always seething? Many of her *intelligensia* have lately found a haven in the Catholic Church, and there is no doubt that the peasants also, if her claim were presented to them, could be recruited in masses. Merezhkovsky, the writer, was one of those who, before the war, disgusted with the State Church while cherishing her dogmas, hoped for the coming of the Holy Ghost to combine and enlighten the Faithful. He believed the time at hand when the promised Spirit would breathe on the world and arouse a revolution to bring about the Kingdom of God. Meanwhile, in preparation for the Paraclete, strength should be sought in the Holy Eucharist, although dispensed by unworthy hands. But when the Red revolution came it was soon characterized by Merezhkovsky as the work of Antichrist. "It is an attempt to stifle Russia's mind and to abolish our Faith. . . . But the Son of God will surely triumph and deliver his faithful Russian people."

Merezhkovsky fell a victim to Bolshevik tyranny because he refused to conform to the rule that no writing material should be purchased without government authorization. It meant, of course, rigid censorship, and he used up his last drop of ink and his last stump of lead pencil in denouncing the Communist despots. Not all of Russia's great intellectuals have continued to treasure their beliefs after repudiating the authority of their State-controlled Church. Yet Russians do not easily become either atheists or materialists. Tchekov, who fancied he had shaken off the trammels of creed, wrote to a friend:

You scold me on the score of morality and art. . . . I cannot take it you mean some subtle "higher morality," as there are no lower, higher, or medium moralities, but only one given us by Jesus Christ, which prevents you and me and our friends from stealing, insulting, lying, and so on. . . . I have many sins, but am quits with morality, as I pay for those sins with interest in the discomfort they bring with them.

Absent from his family, he writes to remind them to have a Mass said on the date of his brother's death, and more than once he complains of stagnation in his soul. He rails at certain crusades against materialism: "Men who seek for truth in matter are bound to be materialists."

Show them an incorporeal God in the sky in such a way that they realize Him and there may be some success!" With regard to incredulity he says: "The more stupid the mob the wider it imagines its outlook to be. If anybody has the courage to say he does not understand what he sees, that alone will be something gained in the realm of thought and a step in advance."

It was again Tchekov who recognized the Russian

sense of a need for expiation and the indelible fear of God:

This is a national characteristic. A Russian has ever an indefinite feeling of guilt. Whether there is death or illness in his family, whether he owes money or lends it, a Russian always feels culpable and blames himself in some way.

This is the nation that was to be transformed on modern, godless principles drawn from mere humanity!

Great Britain and the United States

JAMES J. WALSH, M.D., PH.D.

I HAVE lectured in many places during the past year for the Knights of Columbus on Americanism and have usually felt it incumbent on me to emphasize the fact that our American Revolution was fought with the English. There seems a tendency in certain quarters to forget that basic fact, and I understand that there is some question of new histories which are to emphasize the idea that the Revolution was not really fought with the English but with some misrepresentatives of the German king of England who were imposing on the people of this country. Indeed most of the soldiers who fought here were Germans or so-called Hessians, hired for that purpose because the sympathetic English people could not be depended on to supply the soldiers for warfare. As far as the English people were concerned they were all eminently sympathetic with the colonists.

As for the War of 1812, that was of course entirely a mistake on our part, due to politicians who misunderstood or perverted for their own purposes the attitude of England toward this country.

It is rather interesting in the light of these facts to go back to some of the original documents of the early days. Some of Thomas Jefferson's letters, for instance, were written in order to make clear just why we went into that second war with England. They were written under circumstances in which Jefferson was likely to be extremely candid and, therefore, represent the conclusions of a thoughtful American statesman better than any more formal document might represent them. Almost needless to say Jefferson was one of our most far-seeing statesmen. His authorship of the Declaration of Independence makes that very clear, but anyone who knows his familiar correspondence will realize very well that few men faced the problems of his time, and it was the troubled French Revolutionary period, with more clear-sighted vision than Thomas Jefferson.

A series of Jefferson's letters to Madame de Stael discussing the American motives for entering the war with Great Britain were published in the *North American Review* in July, 1918. Madame de Stael had written to Jefferson expressing her sense of shocked indignation

over the fact that the United States, the great republic of the West, should have declared war on England just when that country was engaged in a life and death struggle with Napoleon. The distinguished French authoress, at whose father's house Jefferson recalled some of the pleasantest hours of his life, declared that England had been the great mainstay of the forces that held out against tyranny and that, indeed, for ten years the British had been the sole barrier against "this singular despotism which unites all the means barbarism and civilization can furnish to debase humanity." Madame de Stael then asks how can it be possible that the home of freedom and liberty should practically align itself with the despot of Europe against the country that had been the leader of the forces of hope for mankind.

Jefferson replies very properly disclaiming all responsibility for the policy of the United States, since he no longer held an official position, but completely justifying the declaration of war that had been made. He tells Madame de Stael, however, that he is not surprised she had misunderstood the reason for the action of the United States. Her confusion is due to the efficiency of English propaganda. Jefferson declares that "England has misrepresented to all Europe the ground of the war." His use of the term, all Europe, would seem to indicate that the British Government was taking pains then, as now, to make its misrepresentation of those with whom it was at war, or in serious disagreement, as widespread as possible. Jefferson had evidently come to the conclusion that England's favorite game was to impute unworthy motives whenever there was nothing else to be said. Proudly complacent in regard to its own sense of honor and of justice the British Government impugns the good faith of everyone else, while Jefferson seems to agree with the French in their national estimate of perfidious Albion. Jefferson reminds Madame de Stael not to forget what happened when the English were making war upon America. "Just as in our Revolution the English were perpetually gaining victories over us until they conquered themselves out of our northern continent." How valuable that sentence is as a criterion in our own day of the truth of British statements with

regard to conditions in Ireland, India, Egypt and South Africa.

Jefferson points out very emphatically that English policy makes England inevitably the real enemy of the United States, always to be distrusted and suspected and never more so than when she pretends to be friendly. One is almost surprised not to have Jefferson quote the classical passage, *Timeo Danaos et dona ferentes*, "I fear the Greeks most of all when they are bearing gifts," for the whole tone of his letter to Madame de Stael conveys this impression. He tells her very distinctly that Bonaparte is after all only a passing phase of tyranny, but England endures as the enemy not only of the United States but of any nation that looks for the trade of the world.

Bonaparte will die and his tyrannies die with him, but a nation never dies. The English Government and its pyratrical (*sic*) principles and practises have no fixed term of duration. . . . England is in principle the enemy of all maritime nations as Bonaparte is of the continental nations; and I place in the same line of insult to the human understanding the contention of conquering the ocean to establish continental rights as that of conquering the continent to restore maritime rights. No, my dear Madame, the object of England is the permanent dominion of the ocean and the monopoly of the trade of the world. (Italics Jefferson's.) To secure this she must keep a larger fleet than her resources will maintain. The resources of other nations must then be impressed to supply the deficiency of her own.

It is easy to think that all this has been changed in the years that have passed, now well above a century since Jefferson's words were penned. The history of England ever since has, however, been a wonderful justification of Jefferson's expressions and the finest possible exemplification of his far-sightedness as an individual. Lest this should appear a prejudiced opinion it seems well to quote English authorities with regard to the policy of permanent dominion over the ocean and the monopoly of the trade of the world which the English

have maintained down to our own day. There could surely be no better authority in that matter than Lord Salisbury, one of the Cecils, mouthpiece of British policy and many years Foreign Minister and finally Premier of England. In his review of the volume on "Balkanized Europe," written by Paul Scott Mowrer, Maurice Francis Egan cites Mr. Mowrer's quotation from a speech of Lord Salisbury delivered shortly after the Congress of Berlin. That passage is surely more than amply revelatory of Britain's purposes and is moreover of prime authority.

The occupation of Cyprus, said the noble Lord shortly after the Congress of Berlin, was simply the development of what has been for a long time the traditional policy of the English Government. When the interest of Europe was centered in the conflicts which were being fought out in Spain, England occupied Gibraltar. When the interest of Europe was centered in the conflicts which were being fought out in Italy, England occupied Malta. Now that there is a chance of Europe's interest being centered in Asia Minor or Egypt, England has occupied Cyprus.

It might well be added that now that Europe's interest is centered largely in Central Europe and in Russia, England has occupied Palestine and gained a sure footing in Asia Minor. From there it will be easy to extend her sphere of influence in various directions in the near East, confirm her hold in Egypt, prepare for Arabian domination, neutralize the effect of various Eastern peoples who might ally themselves with India, and thus strengthen the Empire. In view of all this these words of Jefferson are worthy of recall.

Bonaparte will die . . . but a nation never dies. . . . England is in principle the enemy of all maritime nations . . . to secure dominion of the ocean. . . . The resources of other nations must be impressed to supply the deficiency of her own.

There is a danger that we may be a cat's paw for English policy, as true now as when Jefferson penned these words a century ago.

Dante and Mahomet

JOHN C. REVILLE, S.J.

A MEMBER of the Spanish diocesan clergy, Dr. Miguel Asín Palacios, holds the chair of Arabic literature in the Central University of Madrid. He is one of the greatest Arabic scholars in Europe. In all that concerns the Islamic literature of Spain, he speaks with exceptional authority. At the close of the year 1919 he published a volume entitled: "*La Escatología Musulmana en La Divina Comedia*" (Madrid: Maestre), which contained the substance of his address to the Spanish Royal Academy on the occasion of his reception into that body. The discourse of the eminent "Arabist" provoked widespread comment among Dante scholars. For the thesis which he maintained, with a wealth of erudition, and a knowledge of Dante's work and of the Arabian

writers of Spain, which could not be denied, seemed to be a severe blow aimed at the author of the "Divine Comedy." At first sight it appeared to strike from Dante's poetic crown one of its fairest jewels, that of the creative artist, and to exhibit him before the world dressed in the borrowed robes of song. Dante—such would be the conclusion of an ordinary reader of the thesis of Dr. Palacios—had largely copied, plagiarized, perhaps, in his description of the "*Inferno*" and other parts of his immortal poem, from Arabic sources.

But at the end of his searching analysis of the Hispano-Arabic material from which the Florentine Seer of the "*Inferno*" and the "*Paradiso*" might be supposed to have drawn details for his poem, the scholarly and impar-

tial Spanish Academician concludes with a paragraph or two which will reassure all lovers of the Italian master. Whatever may have been the great Catholic poet's debt to his Arabic models, he loses none of his originality or creative power. Dr. Palacios himself is one of the first and the most enthusiastic in maintaining that the honor and the glory of the Italian bard remain undimmed.

Yet Dr. Palacios builds up an apparently strong case against him. In studying the neo-Platonic and mystic doctrines of the Hispano-Mussulman philosopher, Abenmassara, he had found that some of these doctrines had slowly filtered into medieval scholasticism, and had been adopted not only by the doctors of the Franciscan or pre-Thomistic schools, but even by Dante, hitherto supposed to be an Aristotelian pure and simple. In proof of his assertion, Dr. Palacios puts forth the similarity between the *ascension* of Dante and Beatrice to the heights of Paradise, and that of a mystic and philosopher, found in the *Fotuhât* of Abenarabi, a medieval Mussulman *sufi* of Murcia. The Spanish scholar claims, and he cites text after text in the Arabic to make good his claim, that the influence of the poet Abenarabi on parts of Dante's "*Paradiso*" is unmistakable. On further examination of Abenarabi's *ascension*, he found it to be but a mystic adaptation of another *ascension* famous in Islamic theology, the *ascension* or *mirach* of Mahomet from Jerusalem to the throne of God. As this *mirach* was preceded by a night journey or *isrâ*, in which Mahomet visited some of the infernal regions, the Mussulman legend thus made him a precursor of Dante and afforded Dante himself some dim outline of his own story. A further comparison of the general outline of the Mussulman poem with Dante confirmed the suspicions of the Spanish Arabist. These suspicions became conviction when he compared together the episodes, the descriptions, the details, the phraseology of both poems, and more especially when he studied their "architecture," or rather architectonic features.

But the learned Arabist himself, at the close of his scholarly work, reminds his hearers that artistic inspiration need not be independent of all imitation of models. Before him, Ozanam, followed by Cancellieri, had shown how certain passages of the "*Inferno*" and the "*Paradiso*," had as models, or forerunners rather, the Celtic "*Voyage of St. Brendan*," "*St. Patrick's Purgatory*" and the "*Vision of Friar Alberic*," so popular in the Middle Ages. Artistic creation, says Dr. Asin, need not necessarily be absolute. Even the greatest literary creators, like Homer and Shakespeare, mold pre-existing material to the perfection of the masterpiece; the crude and lumpish clay they fashion to forms of immortal beauty. Dante, we know, tried to master all the knowledge of his age. That age was saturated with Islamic thought. Palermo and Toledo, as is well known, were centers of Mussulman culture. In the case of the work of Abenarabi, Dr. Palacios, still holding that the genius of Dante is not thereby diminished, maintains that his influence can be distinctly traced. Other scholars, among

them Paget-Toynbee, and especially Blochet, who has made a special study of Oriental influences on Dante, maintain a similar position, though they do not proceed so critically or so surely as the learned Spanish priest. But in conclusion Dr. Palacios boldly affirms that Catholicism alone is the key to Dante. Islam, after all, he says, is but a counterfeit of the Mosaic Law and the Gospel. It is from Moses and from the Divine Founder of Christianity that it borrowed the great dogmas of a future life. But in borrowing it distorted them. It perverted them into fantasies or made them only empty dreams. Abenarabi and the other Islamic writers, who may have influenced Dante, crudely plagiarized the austere and noble dogmas of the Catholic Faith. Dante returned to the treasury of the Western World the precious gems which they had stolen.

Dr. Asin's reasoning as to the use Dante made of Islamic sources does not meet with the unqualified approval of Dante experts. It is refuted among others by Bellesort's "*Dante et Mahomet*" (*Revue des Deux Mondes*), and by G. Gabrielli in his "*Intorno alle Fonti Orientali della Divina Commedia*" (Roma: Poliglotta Vaticana). Without going into the discussion here more deeply than wisely, it is sufficient to notice that the singer of Beatrice nowhere gives any proof that he had any direct knowledge of Arabic itself or of the Arabic sources, which, according to Dr. Palacios, influenced him. Indirectly only, from travelers like Brunetto Latini, records and chronicles of Italian and Spanish pilgrims and seafarers to the East, he may have gathered some such information.

Dante is Catholic to the core. He is profoundly original in the whole conception and execution of his immortal poem. He is none other but Dante, whether he depicts the freshness of his innocent love for Beatrice in the "*Vita Nuova*," or outlines his plan of a world-federation, a league of nations in his "*De Monarchia*," or describes in burning phrase the pride of Farinata locked in his tomb. His inspiration is Catholic, not Mussulman. While admiring the vastness and force of his genius, says Pope Benedict XV in his Encyclical on the poet's sixth centenary,

We must also recognize the powerful impulse which he derived from Divine Faith and which enabled him to embellish his immortal poem with the many-hued light of Divine truth, no less than with all the splendor of art. In fact, his "*Commedia*," which has deservedly received the title of "Divine," . . . aims at nothing else than to glorify the justice and the Providence of God, who governs the world in time and eternity and punishes or rewards the actions of individuals and of human society.

He is the Thomas Aquinas of song. He is the poet of scholasticism, the lyrist of Catholic dogma. In the "*Inferno*," the "*Purgatorio*," the "*Paradiso*," its heights are gaged, its depths sounded. With iron knell, in plangent yet hope-buoyed strains, with golden verse tuned to the symphonies of immortal spirits fretting the domes of the Blessed and the palace of the King, he chants its mysteries. Theologian-poet he unites in his magic words

the accuracy, the precision, the depth and force of the "Summa" of St. Thomas, to the daring of the artists who imprisoned dawn and sunlight, the turquoise-blue heavens and the emerald seas in the stained-glass windows of Chartres and York, carved the Old Testament and the New in endless theories on the portal of Reims and greeted the breaking morn with the towers of Notre Dame. Italian, medieval, Ghibelline, political partisan, the last of the Romans, for Rome, the seat of a world-wide empire, was one of his dreams; lover of Beatrice, whom he worships as the ideal of all that humanity can be, he combines deep individual passion and intensity with entire obedience to that one supreme law. In the cathedrals of the Middle Ages all the arts of the day, architecture, sculpture, painting, work of artist and craftsman, of goldsmith and ironmaster, of woodcarver and illuminist, were gloriously enshrined. In the "Summa" of St. Thomas was treasured all theology. In the masterpiece of the Florentine, we find a summary of all that these ages knew of physics, astronomy, mythology, politics, history. But over all Catholic dogma rules as mistress and queen. It invests his song with an austere majesty, a light as serene as that which shone from the eyes of Beatrice, symbol of faith and highest love, when she led him up the holy hills. In the making of his poem, as the inspired singer himself proudly says, heaven and earth joined hands.

Never was poem more objective in its living realities. Yet behind its titanic conceptions, scenes of terror and sights of woe, which would have made Aeschylus tremble; behind Ugolino's Hunger Tower and the yawning gulf of the Caina, so powerfully described, there is a mighty symbol. The "Divine Comedy" is the poem of the supernatural, not only because hell, purgatory, heaven, as presented by the poet, are dogmas of Divine Revelation, but because the supernatural is the very heart and core of the theme. Its main purpose is to place before us the central fact of the supernatural world, the transformation, the "divinizing" of the soul through the power of grace. The "Commedia" is the passage of Dante, type and representative of humanity, the ascent of the human race from the darkness of the forest of life to the splendors of "Paradise," from the depth of sin to the heights of glory. But it is no pale allegory, no uninspired Pilgrim's Progress. It is the most moving drama poet ever dreamed or singer ever married to immortal verse. The bard of Beatrice was right. In the making of his poem deep as the pit, lofty as the Vision of the Mount of God, heaven and earth joined hands. At the high-altar in this many-aisled cathedral, dogma enlightened genius and faith crowned love.

For the Land of Columbus

JOHN B. KENNEDY.

THERE are, of course, those who dispute the fact, more because they cherish disputes rather than facts, that Christopher Columbus discovered America.

The first announcements concerning the American history movement of the Knights of Columbus have excited scores of such disputants. They have written dozens of eminently unlearned letters asserting that Columbus was a Jew, a slave-trader, an atheist, practically everything, in fact, totally unrelated to his primal position, that of physical discoverer of America.

A glance at the time-worn controversy regarding the motives of Columbus in setting out on his voyage of discovery, reveal a variety of material inducements for the voyage. Learned theorists, always the most dangerous class, assign numerous reasons for the expeditions, all human. I have always thought it the simplest of methods, when puzzled at a policeman's genial tattooing of the sidewalk with his nightstick, to approach the policeman himself for an explanation. It is so much more direct when you find a stout, elderly person attempting to walk on his hands instead of on his feet, to ask him to explain his innovation, rather than to rush to the nearest university and consult a Hegelian professor. We humbler folk, like the small boys loudly inquisitive concerning poets' infidelity to the barber, prefer this way of doing things. That is why we accept Columbus' reason for his journey—the desire to live up to the name bestowed on him in Baptism, Christopher, the Christ-bearer: the investment of his genius and his valor in the cause of Christ, that the Gospel might be taught to all nations. And having just returned from a privileged view of some of the old missions that followed in the wake of Columbus we are convinced that the chief law of evidence, the tangible results of a motive, substantiate our faith in Columbus.

Hence the painful paradox. The first men of our Christian civilization to blaze the trail of civilized habitation in America make it possible for a generation to come forth, that not only denies Columbus but attempts, by the crude gesture of the dollar, to elbow from the land of Columbus the Faith that led Columbus to make possible them and their dollars.

If, in America, this fifteenth carbon copy of Columbus' Christianity that those dollar-bedecked persons espouse, had produced even a memory of the happy era of the missionaries who followed immediately in the footsteps of Columbus, we might view with tolerance, if not with approval, their attempts to introduce into the land of Columbus their particular views of how that land should religiously prosper. But they and their colossal negativism have produced an America that is hard and dry, un-Christianly hard and unconscionably dry. What then, do they propose for Italy, the land of Columbus? Hardness? Dryness? Or the impoverished spiritual life for which they have discovered a new and evil name, religious efficiency?

Who shall answer these questions? No less than the Supreme Pontiff, his Holiness Pope Benedict XV, has elected that the Knights of Columbus shall answer them. He has called upon the Knights of Columbus to resist

this invasion of the land of Columbus; this endowed religious piracy.

There are, really, the elements of a great economic tragedy in the issue of religious controversy. In the city of San Francisco, merely to be typical, there are more than 600,000 souls, of which more than 300,000 profess the Catholic Faith, while but 16,000 profess Protestantism. There is misery, sin and irreligion in San Francisco. Not more, proportionately, than in any other American city; but sufficient to arouse the pity of any sincere Christian, however diluted his faith. The city of Rome is the home of Christendom. The city of Rome has less apparent vice, less apparent anti-Christianity than any city of its size in the world. Yet millions of American dollars are boastfully devoted to convert Italians from Catholicism. To what?

The temptation is to be bitter, to be most un-Christianly sarcastic. But it is a temptation. Where the bliss of ignorance induces visions of the Pope as Anti-Christ, it is quite conceivable that it may also cast the purple glow of magnanimity over anti-Christian proselytism. Doubtless there are some small Italians who will accept a shower-bath and a bowl of soup in return for a promise not to make the Sign of the Cross. But if that sign is denounced as superstition, how shall we denounce the sign of the dollar? The Sign of the Cross, even sensuously considered, is the most graceful of human gestures; the body is marvelously designed for it; but how shall we avoid the ludicrous in supplanting it by the sign of the dollar?

August 28, 1920, no matter what else it signified, was the most solemn day in the history of the Knights of Columbus, for on that day, looking into the eyes of the Supreme Knight of the Order and speaking with the voice of ultimate earthly authority, the Vicar of Christ, Benedict XV, summoned the Knights of Columbus to serve him, to do in Rome what they had successfully done elsewhere, the welfare work, non-commercial, humanly effective, that had provided the abiding basis of Knights of Columbus popularity among the millions of young men who served in the army and navy of America.

Some, unusually dull, have phrased it that the Pope called the K. of C. to compete with Protestant endeavor. Nothing could be further from the truth. Poetic justice does not admit competition. And it is merely poetic justice, when the land of Columbus is beset by a heavily financed contradiction of the essence of the spirit of Columbus, that from the land Columbus discovered there should emanate some force to nullify that contradiction. This is merely an involved way of revising the doughboy rhyme, "We've paid our debt to Lafayette." Now we must pay our debt to Columbus.

The average American citizen, considering him merely physically and mentally, abstracting from spiritual caste or classification, is a sturdy, common-sense person who cannot, for the life of him, see why good American dollars should be expended on uplift work that ignores

the law of spiritual gravity, which in the case of the Latin soul means tendency to the Catholic Faith or to nothing. There is something specious in the argument that if the Italians did not want Protestant ministrations, whether of baseball or hymn-books, they would not accept them; but there is also something specious in the argument of the slick gentlemen who deal in gold-bricks with rural persons.

To have aroused the Voice in the Vatican to utter one of the strongest protests that has been heard from the Vatican in recent years serious offense must have been given. No cynical dismissal that the Vatican fears an invasion of its monopoly in Italian religious matters can be accepted. It is not logic, it is rudeness. Italy has been greatly disturbed as a result of the war. America could never complacently view the country of her discoverer ruled by the red flag of Socialist terrorism. Without the Vatican, it is most probable that such would have been Italy's fate; without the active faith and spiritual discipline that proselytism, no matter what its professions, or even its skimmed sincerities, would destroy, Italy could not have withstood the cataclysm of peace bravely as she survived the cruel test of the war.

The Knights of Columbus, in voting \$1,000,000—to be subscribed by their members and any interested in the movement, although not to be made the object of a public "drive"—for their work in Italy under the auspices of the Supreme Pontiff, are providing constructive work to offset the destruction of missions; are taking steps to pay back to the land of Columbus something of the debt of gratitude Columbia owes his memory. It is not competition in welfare work, it is not religious warfare; it is simply a movement to sustain through the introduction of American welfare work the positive faith of Italian youth, and to preserve the seat of Christendom from the continuance of the spectacle of unimpeded "missions" to the kin of the hero who brought the Faith to the new world.

Normal Religion

FLOYD KEELER

THE newspapers of the day are full of talk about the normal. We hear that prices must get back to normal, and that in many instances they are doing so. We hear of normal trade conditions, the normal outlook upon world problems, a normal estimate of the significance of things about us. All this is contrasted with the unquestionably abnormal situation since 1914, when the world was so completely upset that values and perspective have been reckoned according to no standard known before that time. And so the cry is, "Get back to normal"—presuming that things were fairly normal at the time mentioned.

Naturally many views concerning religious matters have undergone something of the transformation that has taken place in all other departments of life. No cataclysm since the Flood has, probably, had such far-

reaching consequences, or so changed man's outlook. It is very natural that religion should share in this upheaval, and, in view of what has been presented to man in many places as religion, should not satisfy man as it did six or seven years ago. But religious conditions were not normal then. One of our militant Protestant contemporaries, the editor of the Methodist *Christian Advocate*, seems to feel this in a recent editorial which he entitled, "Back to the Old or Forward to a New Normal." He decries the sentiment "Get Back to Normal" and says:

It is the new normal, then, that beckons the Church of God; a better, nobler, truer, worthier normal and one upon which the Church will contribute to the construction of a finer type of civilization in every land under the shining sun. Into the development of this new normal there ought to go all the product of those experiences—many of them mingled with the bitterness of disappointment and disillusionment—that have come to the Church out of the burning fiery furnace of the last few years. And into the ambition to realize that new normal there should be poured all the devotion of which the Church is capable. For we have come into a great and wonderful and glorious day, and many of the old things have passed away, never to return; and while all things have not become new, yet the signs of newness are apparent to those who have eyes to see the things of God as they are developing for the blessing of mankind.

No. The Church of God must not "get back to normal," the old normal. It must go forward to a diviner normal.

This all sounds very well for a Methodist, for he must, like the Athenians of old, keep looking for "some new thing." The editor is particularly unhappy in illustrating how we must not get "back to normal," for he urges, "What would have happened to the Church and to civilization if Luther had given heed to the 'get back to normal' plea? And in further proof of his alleged attempt to essay 'the difficult task of purifying the Church from its pollution and degradation,' we are told that 'He defied the established authorities and preached his new interpretation of justification by faith, and let in the light of a new day upon darkened and bewildered minds.'" From which it would appear that anarchy is the only means of progress and is to be considered "normal" in the Church of the Living God, the God of all order and law.

Now let us suppose that instead of being an incontinent and disobedient priest, Luther had been content to "get back to normal," and instead of setting up a rebellion had helped to reform things inside the Church. There were things which sadly needed reformation at that time, but why does our Methodist friend insist that these abuses constituted the "normal"? Has his prejudiced reading of history so blinded him to the obvious fact that the times just before the rise of Luther were no more normal than those through which we are now passing? If he ever read anything authentic concerning the Council of Trent he will know that it wrought more reforms than the "reformers" ever dreamed of, and it wrought them in a perfectly legitimate and sensible way.

It is to Trent and not to Augsburg that we must look for attempts to recover the normal.

Again the editor uses John Wesley as an illustration, a little more apt, but still far from proving his contention. He says, "Suppose he had been content merely to help England to 'get back to normal?'" Well, suppose he had? We may well doubt whether things would have been so much worse off. Why is it considered a thing to be highly commended that "he defied the authorities of the Church of England?" I am willing to agree that England, and the Church of England, had both fallen on evil days. The drying up of spiritual life in the severed branch seemed about complete, but what is that "normal" which seems so undesirable? It has been a long time since England has had anything approaching the normal in her national Christian life. Had Wesley even had an idea of the existence of that normal which once made England fair "Mary's Dower" he might better have spent his career in helping to get back to it.

The theory of evolution has come to be so completely ingrained in modern Protestant thinking that we often forget how completely Protestants base everything upon it. The old evangelical basis is gone. The first chapters of Genesis are considered to be pretty myths; the fall of man is a figment of the imagination. Protestant leaders no more question the origin of man, rational soul and all, as an evolved protoplasm than they do the phenomena of everyday experience. Hence there is no "normal" in creation. And the same thing is true with regard to Our Lord's ministry and the foundation of His Church. We are gravely told that He never spoke of the Church, and if one would point out the Gospel passages wherein the Church is mentioned they are waved aside as not meeting "the test of authenticity." That ought to squelch anyone! But suppose one still had a lingering idea that the Holy Scriptures are the Word of God, that the Gospels do portray truthfully the life and sayings of Jesus of Nazareth, and that His claim to be God, as recorded therein, is true. Suppose that He did come with all power and all authority and that He did, as these Gospels record, establish a Church against which the gates of hell should not prevail, and whose rulers He sent forth armed with His own authority. "As the Father hath sent Me, so send I you." What bearing has all this on the "normal"? Clearly it means that as He Himself is "the Way," the Church in which is the extension of His Incarnation alone can safely point to that Way; that as He is "the Truth," the Church of which He is the invisible Head can alone be trusted to utter words of truth or to interpret them correctly; that as He is "the Life," through His Divinely-ordered means alone can life eternal ordinarily be impaired. This then is the normal, and there can be no "diviner" one. So whether one must go "back" or "forward" to reach it is a matter of terms. The important thing is that one must seek it if he would be sure of salvation.

COMMUNICATIONS

Letters as a rule should not exceed six hundred words.

The Classics

To the Editor of AMERICA:

Some weeks ago there appeared in AMERICA a thoughtful article on the Classics, written by the Rev. Francis Donnelly, S.J. Each week since then I have read AMERICA most carefully to see if a discussion of the paper had begun, but I have been disappointed. As the father of a boy who is protesting vigorously against "that stuff, Greek," I petition for an extension of remarks.

Hoboken.

E. L. M.

Not the One Big Union

To the Editor of AMERICA:

In the August 13 issue of AMERICA there appeared an article under Sociology by Gerald C. Treacy, S.J., entitled "One Big Union." What attracted my attention to this article was the title in large letters on the front page of this issue: "One Big Union for Organized Labor." This title gave me quite a start and it was only after reading the article that I realized that it did not refer to *The One Big Union*, more commonly known as the O. B. U. I am heartily in favor of Father Treacy's contention that there should be some one union founded on Christian principles, and I do not want to find fault with what he has said, but I do believe that it was, to say the least, unfortunate that the front page of AMERICA should carry in such large letters the title of one of the most radical organizations in the United States, and from a casual glance at Father Treacy's article one would again gather that a leading Catholic periodical was favoring the One Big Union.

The One Big Union is very closely related to the I.W.W.; in fact, it was organized for the purpose of securing additional I.W.W. members from the A. F. of L. under the guise of being a strong labor union and better able to obtain better living conditions, wages, etc., for laboring men than the A. F. of L. can procure. The great majority of Americans are unfamiliar with the many ramifications of the I.W.W., and I believe but few know about the O.B.U. and its connection with the I.W.W. Hence a person reading Father Treacy's article might through ignorance assume that a Catholic priest and AMERICA favored the O.B.U., and if he happened to say such a thing to some worthy Protestant friend it would not be long before the report would be circulated that the Pope himself endorsed the radical organization, the One Big Union.

This may seem pretty far fetched, but just such an incident occurred in this town not so very long ago when a man, in speaking of a certain organization, left off one word of the title of the organization which he intended to speak of and thereby spoke of a decidedly radical organization, and as he happened to be speaking to a Federal officer who was very much interested in this certain radical organization, he almost caused extreme annoyance to some perfectly innocent people. I am calling this to your attention because I have found that non-Catholics are only too apt to misconstrue innocent remarks like the above and use them as a basis for another attack on the Catholic Church. I hope you will not think that I am trying to criticize this article of AMERICA. I have written this because I felt that it did offer a chance for misunderstanding on someone's part.

San Antonio.

J. M. THOMPSON.

Dr. Lyman Abbott on Uniformity of Belief

To the Editor of AMERICA:

It is, as a rule, a useless and profitless task to challenge all the foolish utterances that men make about religion, for, when religion is in question, persons who in other matters are of most sound and reputable judgment, generally make the most stupid blunders. Comments, however, are not always out of place. Dr. Lyman Abbott's theological views, for example, are broad enough to satisfy the most liberal Theist. These views of his

are quite well known; but in reply to a correspondent in the *Outlook* for July 21, he makes so brilliant an addition to his patchwork quilt of personal dogma, that it merits some attention. His subject this time is uniformity of belief. A correspondent's letter evokes from the Doctor an expression of opinion that uniformity of religious belief and teaching is very undesirable.

What humanity needs, what is necessary to human progress and real intellectual, spiritual life is not uniformity of doctrine but liberty and variety. The unity must be . . . a unity of emotion and purpose not a unity of intellectual opinion; it must be found in the prayers and hymns of the Church, not in the sermons of the ministers nor in creeds ancient and modern."

Can it be possible that Dr. Abbott does not see the meaning of such remarks? Here we have a sentence, the last I quoted, with quite as many errors as there are separate ideas. The Doctor wants unity of emotion to begin with. What does he mean? Ordinarily the emotions of civilized communities are based on intellect, on real grounds. Does he counsel reversion to the primeval? Now how can emotion be unified, that is, have a common object and expression, unless there be a common intellectual basis on which to unify it? Yet, he at once says there must not be unity of intellectual opinion. In other words, he tells us to get the effect by dispensing with the cause. This is rather a novel proposal even in our day.

Again, he pleads for unity of purpose. But first of all, what is purpose? Externally I take it to be coordination of impulse to a recognized objective. Internally it is the will to do something. Externally or internally, unity of purpose implies the attempt to get the same results as others. Yet how can that be in religion, if I hold the Trinity and you deny it, if I believe in the Divinity of Christ and you are a Unitarian? The Doctor wants unity in prayers but not in sermons. I wonder why? Perhaps he would leave scope for imaginative doctrinal flights. In other words he would have a sort of unity in the accepted body of truth and variety in the interpretation, even if the interpretation flatly contradicts the accepted truth. And yet a moment later he says that there should be no unity in the body of accepted truth because unity is dogmatism, and he adds that if there had been uniformity of belief in religion there would "never have been Wesleyanism, nor Puritanism, nor Protestantism, nor even Christianity."

Dr. Abbott should be on his guard against false analogies. There is, after all, such a thing as objective truth. Christ dispensed with a certain form of religious worship, which was a figure, in order to establish the full truth, but this fact does not confer on Luther or Wesley or anyone else the power to set aside the essential unity of God's truth in order to give scope to his own doctrinal innovations. In one case there is a departure from limited symbolic truth to full essential truth. In the other there is a departure from full truth to doubt and error. Dr. Abbott thinks to dispose of the difficulty by saying that unity is secured by loyalty to a Person, not by what others have thought about that Person. But when the thoughts of others are based simply on that Person's explicit explanation of His own character and doctrine, surely, if the explanation is not worth following the Person must be less so. For if He did not know His own character and mission, how can He ask us to follow Him? Unless, perchance, it be that the Doctor can interpret such a Person and His work better than the Person could Himself. And if this is true should we not rather follow Dr. Abbott and let Christ go?

It is one of the most amusing of paradoxes that intolerance of the intolerance of others, like the dissidence of dissent, is the inner shrine of intolerance, the most dogmatic of dogma, the most intolerant of intolerances.

Roxbury.

C. AUGUSTINE BLAKE.

AMERICA

A · CATHOLIC · REVIEW · OF · THE · WEEK

SATURDAY, September 3, 1921

Entered as second-class matter, April 15, 1909, at the Post Office at New York, N. Y., under the Act of March 3, 1879. Acceptance for mailing at Special rate of postage provided for in Section 1103, Act of October 3, 1917, authorized on June 29, 1918.

Published weekly by The America Press, New York.
President, RICHARD H. TIERNEY; Secretary, JOSEPH HUSSLEIN;
Treasurer, FRANCIS A. BREEN.

SUBSCRIPTIONS, POSTPAID:
United States, 10 cents a copy; yearly, \$4.00
Canada, \$4.50 - - - Europe \$5.00

Address:
THE AMERICA PRESS, 173 East 83d Street, New York, N. Y., U. S. A.
CABLE ADDRESS: CATHREVIEW
Stamps should be sent for the return of rejected manuscripts.

No Time for God

IT is a sad picture that an Englishman paints of what was once merry England. For England was in the days of faith a nation of happy hearts and healthy souls. The ringing of the church bell found a ready welcome in the soul of a nation that thought little of purse-power and much of prayer power. England once knew how to pray. How different the present picture of a land unquestionably great with the greatness of modern materialism:

Over all the land the old gray towers and spires of the churches still bear witness to the faith that has grown cold, but they are empty churches and their bells no longer summon the good people to tender meditation and to gentle prayer. *England has no time for God.*

There are, it is true, some churches which are not empty and some which are full. But the empty church is the rule rather than the exception. So is the empty chapel. Never in my lifetime has religion ebbed so low. Never has the spiritual pulse of the nation beat so feebly. It is the soul of the nation that is empty. *England has no time for God.*

The war found England at the forefront of modern progress. The peace left her stronger in material forces, ships of steel, power of arms, riches in lands and gold. An imperial conference has borne witness to the world, of the triumph of the British name. It has ringed a world with a far-flung line of trade, pushing its flag into every port. Dominion "over palm and pine" she has. Dominion over her soul she has not. An Englishman writing in the *Daily Express* proclaims that soul empty.

Heightening the picture Bishop Hensen of Durham in the *Daily Telegraph* declares that "materialism has for the moment triumphed, and its triumph can only work out in destruction. It must always be so. When man rejects His spirit, he perishes." If this combined indictment were written by Americans instead of by Englishmen it would be branded as anti-British propaganda. It is in fact anti-modern propaganda, sober truth as applicable to America as to Britain. For the soul of America is almost as empty as the soul of England. She has no time for God. He is not in her homes that are wrecked by divorce. He is not in her schools where His

Name is banned. For the fervid hands-across-the-sea enthusiasts who are anxious to mark kindred ties between the great English-speaking nations of the world here is a likeness that is not pleasant to dwell upon. Likeness in blood is a myth, likeness in ideals of political liberty is lacking, likeness in soul-emptiness is a dark reality.

Yet there is light in the darkness, for the soul of America is young. She has evidenced the idealism of youth in her call to the older nations to lay aside the arguments of force and initiate a new order with the argument of arbitration. In the day of her might she has not forgotten that the way to peace is through justice and fair dealing, not through terror or fire or sword. If the other nations hearken they will save themselves from the increasing burden of armament, and the hypocrisy of secret diplomacy. In calling the nations to the council table instead of to the battlefields America has shown that her soul is not altogether empty. She is taking the first step that will lead to the crushing of materialism on which the world has rocked for centuries till it has been brought to the present pass of near-ruin and chaos. In this she is truly great for she is pointing the way toward a great discovery, greater than land or gold.

In Contempt of the Law

SOME years ago a law forbidding interstate transmissal of prize-fight moving pictures was pushed through Congress. It was, frankly, special legislation. While it was not held that such pictures were, in general, demoralizing, a particular picture representing a battle in which a white man was cruelly beaten by a black brother, was believed to contain possibilities of stirring up race riots. To forefend this evil, against which any cross-roads village could have protected itself by its own enactments, the wheels of the great Federal machine were set in motion to grind out a bit of petty legislation.

Last July, the "battle of the century," if one omits the minor conflicts in Belgium and northern France, was staged and pictured in New Jersey. Not having the fear of the Federal law before his wicked eyes, Mr. "Tex" Rickard promptly transported the film to New York, with the charitable purpose of showing it "to the wounded soldiers." This good Samaritan was forthwith arrested, indicted and convicted by the Federal Government. Arraigned for sentence, the judge remarked that as the law was probably unconstitutional, he would not send Mr. Rickard to jail. Instead he would fine him \$1,000. Thereupon Mr. Rickard proceeded to do what he had come into the State of New York to do. He leased six theaters, and began to show his film to anyone who had at least fifty cents, plus the war tax of a nickel. For the State of New York, having greater problems on its hands, had neglected to ban prize-fight pictures, a fact which Mr. Rickard had ascertained long before he embarked for New York on the Weehawken ferry with his film in a bag. All he had to do was to pay a license of

\$1,000 to the Federal Government, and then like another Mrs. Jarley, begin to amuse and instruct the public with his unparalleled film. At the latest accounts, Mr. Rickard had proceeded as far west as Chicago, where he has likewise been arrested and released on bail.

Of course, all this is plainly *in fraudem legis*, a scheme to beat the devil around a stump. Mr. Rickard will probably succeed as well in Chicago as he did in New York, and turn a penal law into a local license-bureau regulation. When a Federal judge enforces a law, remarking at the same time that it is probably unconstitutional, a mere prize-fight promoter may be pardoned for concluding that the law in general is to be obeyed only when it cannot possibly be evaded. Mr. Rickard is neither a prize-fighter, nor a lawyer, nor a member of Congress, but must live by his wits. When his wits fall afoul of the law, it will be a stand-up fight to the end, with the odds in favor of Mr. Rickard, if his opponent be a "fool" law. But in any case, the odds will be heavily in favor of contempt of law.

"Fool" laws, State and Federal, are far more of a menace to peace and order than the "Reds" with whom we have been so deeply concerned for the last two years. An intelligent man may obey an unintelligent law, as far as he can, but he cannot be asked to respect it. As for the unintelligent, they simply spurn it. Taking Barnum's estimate as substantially accurate, the danger of this kind of legislation is obvious. It does not promote the community welfare and it actively fosters contempt of authority.

The Imperial Wizard Unmasks

THE Imperial Wizard of the Ku Klux Klan, Mr. William Joseph Simmons, has been sojourning in Chicago. He has also been talking. He is no stopped clock, right twice a day, but a going concern, wrong all the time, and in every tick betraying himself. On this occasion, the Imperial Wizard spoke with gravity and decision. He does not approve of the Jews "because they do not profess the Christian religion," nor of Catholics, "because they owe an allegiance that is foreign to the Government of the United States."

There is more truth in this latter statement than the Imperial Wizard suspects, although it is, of course, ludicrously untrue in the meaning affixed to it by the Imperial Wizard. An unfriendly critic recently confessed that while the late Chief Justice White was a "papist," no one could ever discover that any act of his, public or private, had given rise to the suspicion that he bore a political allegiance to any country but the United States. The same might also be confessed of the thousands of Catholic boys who gave their lives for their country in the late war, and of the few Catholics now in public office, Admiral Benson, for example, who would probably be surprised to learn that, as a Catholic, he "owes an allegiance that is foreign to the Government of the United States."

The Imperial Wizard's error arises from the fact that he is unable to conceive of a higher allegiance than an allegiance which is political. He is probably as unfamiliar with the Bible as he is with the Constitution of the United States, but a very brief examination of the Sacred Writings will show how in the teaching both of the Old and the New Testaments, man's first allegiance is not to the political entity called the State, but to Almighty God. This is the supreme allegiance of every Catholic, and he does not conceive that it is an allegiance "foreign to the Government of the United States." Sad inroads have been made of late years into our constitutional form of government. But it does not as yet appear that for all these changes, Almighty God is, in a constitutional sense, a foreigner.

From the ranks of American Catholics no Benedict Arnold, whom, by the way, Mr. Simmons strikingly resembles in his hatred of the Catholic Church, has come. Nor has any American Catholic ever experienced the least difficulty in taking an oath of allegiance to his State or to the Federal Government. The Imperial Wizard will, of course, attribute this easiness to Catholic sophistry and utter lack of good faith and honor. However, as this attribution necessitates the assumption that every Catholic who has taken the oath of allegiance is either a fool or a knave, it may be dismissed. But to the principle that, in case of conflict, we must obey God rather than the civil power, because man's supreme allegiance is to God, every Catholic gives full assent. To deny it is to place the State, a creature, above God, the Creator.

Our "Model" Divorce Laws

THE term is a "misnomer." There can be no "model" law permitting divorce, just as there can be no "model" law to authorize theft, lying, perjury, oppression, or race-suicide. But while the only "model" divorce law is that of South Carolina which absolutely forbids divorce, still it is plain that some laws are worse than others. When enacted years ago, the New York law was thought to be a model statute, since it granted divorce for one cause only, and prohibited remarriage to the guilty party for a period of one year. Unfortunately, however, this law has not fulfilled the hopes of its authors. It has not decreased the number of divorces, and it has directly occasioned some very serious evils.

Again and again have the courts been helpless in the face of collusion and perjury. For a fixed sum detective agencies will "frame" an innocent party, thereby allowing a guilty husband or wife to contract a second marriage; or, tiring of the contract, husband and wife will agree that one of them be "trapped" to secure the necessary evidence. To avoid the scandal which arises from the public hearings in many of these cases, the custom of submitting the evidence to a referee appointed by the court has become common. The hearings are in private, and the records are sealed from the public by the

court. This well-meant provision has operated to secure the very element of secrecy which the degraded members of the profession need for their nefarious work, and last month the Supreme Court voted to abolish the sealed verdict. After twenty years, it must be confessed that the New York law has not done much to remove the social cancer of divorce. It may be doubted whether in the absence of a higher public standard of morality than now obtains, any law could do much better. If men and women desire divorce, they will obtain it.

There is one remedy for this fearful evil, but there is small chance that the country will ever give it a fair trial. That remedy is the religious training of the child. If we can bring up a generation filled with a horror of divorce and with a religious reverence for the sacredness of marriage, there is hope for the future. But as religion dies among our people, and it seems to be growing weaker day by day, the prospect for a genuinely monogamous race becomes darker.

Magistrate McQuaide and Congress

THE events of the past week have discovered in New York, lately the favored lair of the jackrabbit, a genuine American. He is a city magistrate, and his name is McQuaide. On a prosecution under the Mullan-Gage State prohibition law, it was disclosed that a policeman had made his way into a citizen's place of business, and had there discovered several bottles of whiskey. This testimony was not impeached. But the proceedings further disclosed that the officer of the law had forced his way into the premises without a warrant. At this, Magistrate McQuaide dismissed the case, and ordered the arrest of the officer on a charge of oppression.

This magistrate was acting on a principle not directly in question in the debates on the Stanley amendments, but his brave course may be commended to the Anti-Saloon Leaguers in Congress. By common consent they are called "the dries," although some of them, in the picturesque words of Senator Reed, "voted for prohibition with a whiskey breath, and have been violating the law for which they voted ever since it was passed." In refusing to adopt the Stanley amendment, these gentlemen are simply refusing to approve the Fourth Amend-

ment to the Constitution, and in urging a substitute are striving to destroy the Fourth Amendment. The possible consequences, should their efforts succeed, are extremely grave. They involve the destruction not only of the Amendments, but of the entire Constitution.

This is clear from even a brief examination of the Amendments. If Congress can destroy the guarantees contained in the Fourth Amendment, it can destroy the guarantees contained in any other Amendment, since all rest on the same authority. It can, for instance, abolish freedom of speech. It can forbid the people to assemble peaceably to petition the Government for a redress of grievances. In time of peace it can quarter troops in any private dwelling. Without presentment from a grand jury it can hold a man to answer for crime. For the same offense it can twice place him in jeopardy of life and limb. It can compel him to witness against himself in a criminal action. Without process of law, and all that this implies, it can deprive him of life, liberty, or property. It can take his goods for public use without just compensation. It can deny him the right of a speedy and a public trial; refuse to inform him of the nature and the cause of the accusation brought against him; decline to permit him to confront his accusers; deny him compulsory process to obtain witnesses in his favor, and deprive him of the assistance of counsel. It can require excessive bail, exact excessive fines, and impose a cruel and unusual punishment. These are the rights with which Congress is forbidden to interfere by the first eight Amendments. But if Congress can interfere with, or destroy, a right protected by the Fourth of these Amendments, Congress can interfere with, or destroy, a right protected by any or all of these Amendments. It is the fourth Amendment which the Anti-Saloon League now proposes to destroy.

As has been stated again and again in these pages, either Prohibition, as interpreted by the fanatics, or the rights protected by the Constitution of the United States, must go. The determination of the Prohibitionists to nullify the precious guarantees of the Fourth Amendment, proves that statement beyond cavil. No graver situation has ever been presented to the American people. By supposition a Constitution is the sure protection of minorities. As the Constitution falls what protection is left for us Catholics?

Literature

OUR LITERATURE AND OUR LIFE

THE pessimist may say what he will, and the American novel writer, feeling that he must be gloomy in order to be artistic, may deepen all the shadows of our social conditions and omit all the lights, but the lights exist. Nearly all our novelists are either tragic or farcical. Now, life is very much of a comedy, not only in the sense in which the Latins use the word, but in the sense that life would be unendurable if it were as drab, as hopeless, as material as most of the novelists make it.

The beautiful heroine, for instance, who goes sparkling in to dinner because she owns a limousine, strings of pearls and is

an acknowledged beauty, must logically commit suicide as old age faces her, as she is dependent entirely on the luxuries of life, the first of which is her well-preserved beauty. In nearly all the novels the point of view of the woman is the only point of view considered, and her great affliction is that she is not allowed to have that "good time" which her special problems owe her.

Since a multitude of men in our country have begun to read fiction, mostly of the Wild West or detective type, there will probably be a change in the attitude of the authors toward the male sex. But at present the most interesting episodes of life

generally center around the female of neither brains, talent nor principles. In truth, if we examine much of our fiction, we find that while it depicts certain atmospheric effects, certain local conditions and certain minor characters excellently, it has neither breadth nor depth. The same may be said of English fiction, but there is less reason for the American to fail, because, although we have not so great a background, we have a wider field and the opportunity for a richer experience.

Here, for instance, is a clever novel by Sophie Kerr (Mrs. Underwood). The first half is true to life on the Eastern Shore of Maryland; these chapters are better done than any chapter in "Main Street"; and the value of a certain spiritual quality which exists, though it may take erratic forms throughout our country, is admitted. But the heroine, like most of the modern heroines, is a rather dull, uninteresting and uncharming woman. Evidently, however, the author, one of the most promising that we have, is determined that we shall consider her worth while, simply because she is a woman. She must be the center of everything. And when you find a book of fiction which a man can read with any satisfaction, written by a man, the author soon falls into the prevailing fashion before the end, by worshipping an idiot woman of a prevailing type in fiction. Now, we know that the fluffy, selfish, idiot woman may have her day, but she does not, as a rule, make the whole interest of the life of many men; and in real life the lady who passes from husband to husband leaving each husband disconsolate in the end, is not common. On the other hand, if an author today wants to describe what he considers a real man, he must make a brute of him. Since novels are pictures of life at their best, idealized very often, they ought at least not to be imitations or founded on artificial figures. It is true that Victorian conventions kept Thackeray in what would today be considered undue limits; but "Pendennis" is none the worse for that. Thackeray knew a man when he saw him. Among modern novelists William McPhee comes nearest to that, perhaps. The man of the modern novelists has very little will, and the woman is the slave of her emotions and her caprices.

The American stage has no great actors, owing to its commercialism; but it is showing some of the best character mimes that have ever existed on any stage. The theater of Germany and Austria, before the war, was as materialistic and sensual as were their novels. France at least, so far as playwrights were concerned, had Rostand; now today France has nobody. England is even worse off. But nowhere, even at the *Comédie Française*, are to be found actors who present the passing phases of character so truthfully and interestingly as in the United States. But this does not make great art.

The decadence of our novel and our play is due to the lack of a real feeling for romance, or rather a lack of understanding of romance. Heroic patriotism exists in our novels, though an adherence to duty is generally described as without reward; but the canons of right and wrong are painfully obscured. Even when virtue appears, governed by these canons, she is never gay. The "slogan"—lovely word!—of our literature is: "If you can't have everything you want, society is a failure, and you had better die."

There can be no romance where there is no contrast. If the episodes of Paolo and Francesca; of Tristan and Isolde; of Lancelot and Guinevere are perennially interesting, it is because the law broken was potent and mighty, and acknowledged to be so. If you try to get rid of law you must get rid of romance. The lady of the many husbands of the popular novel is really no more interesting than the Turk who, keeping the law of Mohammed, has many wives.

In order to produce romance the Ten Commandments would have to be invented, if they did not exist. The appeal of authors like Ibsen, like Strindberg, like Dostoyevsky is to readers whose traditions are very different from ours, which cannot be readily understood by us. In spite of the license of Strindberg, he must

have the background of a threatening convention to make his weird characters understandable at all. And if Ibsen could not have counted on the shock he gave, not to morality, which he, from the point of view of literature, hardly took into account, but to conventionality, neither "Ghosts" nor the "Doll's House" would have been worth writing. "Brand" and "Peer Gynt" are different things.

Our novelists, if they are to succeed in holding attention, must study more deeply the spiritual values of life—values which exist in every place in our country, although dimmed by the decay of faith and a lack of mysticism. If the American novel is to be read and re-read, as "Don Quixote" or "Pendennis" or "The Marble Faun" is read and re-read, its authors must write for men and women rather than for a clientèle of the young, the uneducated, the inexperienced and the unbelieving.

MAURICE FRANCIS EGAN.

NATURE'S WARNING

When I consider how, from dawn to night,
The hasting hours post on in breathless pace;
How seasons, like swift billows, sequent race,
How Winter treads on Summer's heels in flight;
When I see sink the stricken sun in fight,
And rebel darkness give the moon his place;
When I perceive how short a stay hath grace,
How quick to fail the root whence springs delight:
Then sermons are not needed on Man's end,
Since God hath hung aloft His heavenly book
Where all may read His message in the sky;
And as the day to evensong must tend,
And summer bow before the reaper's hook,
So we, our little course soon run, must die.

J. R. CLEMENS.

REVIEWS

The Age of the Reformation. By PRESERVED SMITH, Ph.D. New York: Henry Holt & Co. \$5.00.

In spite of its shortcomings, this is a remarkable book. It is an attempt to set forth the movement of the Reformation in its relation to the artistic, intellectual, religious and economic tendencies of the sixteenth century. It is not a detailed history of Luther, nor of the Reformation, but a picture rather of these two, with the background across which they moved. Mr. Smith has the historic sense, gages events in their larger and more vital aspects, has widely read and gathered into his 800 pages a mass of interesting and at times not easily available material.

After discussing the economic changes of the later Middle Ages, the rise of the bourgeoisie, nationalism, individualism, the invention of printing, the author reviews the history of the Church from the days of Innocent III, and then studies the causes of the Reformation. He candidly admits that the corruption in the Church was not the main cause, and that the charge of immorality brought against it was greatly exaggerated. The mystics, the pre-Reformers, the nationalization of the churches, humanism, are next studied. Several chapters discuss the Reformation in Germany, Switzerland, France, the Netherlands, England and Scotland; the Counter-Reformation, the Spanish and Portuguese countries. Four chapters analyze the "Social Conditions," the "Capitalistic Revolution," the "Main Currents of Thought" and "Temper of the Times." A final and suggestive chapter deals with the interpretation of the Reformation by various schools. The religious and political interpretation is represented by Bossuet, Sleidan, Sarpi. Montesquieu, Voltaire, Hume, Gibbon then expose their rationalistic theories on the subject. The Liberal-Romantic appreciation follows, as set forth by men like Heine, Ranke, Hegel, Buckle. The "economic and evolutionary" interpretations by Marx, Nietzsche, Santayana, Harnack, Janssen, Pastor, Acton close this remarkable series. The Catholic position is rather jejunely analyzed. We find no

mention of the great nineteenth-century Catholic scholar, Balmes. Mr. Smith has gone about his task in a conscientious spirit. He adds little to the deeper philosophy of the subject, but throws light on many details. The chapter on the "Capitalistic Revolution" is particularly well done.

It is surprising that Mr. Smith should consider Voltaire "one of the greatest historians" (p. 707). Voltaire's mind was hopelessly unhistoric. Of history he knew but the merest borders. His best piece of work, "*Le Siècle de Louis XIV.*," is packed with errors of detail and lacks philosophic insight and vision. The historian's love of truth was not in him. No candid reader will be satisfied with the sections in which Mr. Smith deals with the Jesuits (pp. 396 ff.). He speaks of Jesuitical compromises with God's law, quotes several supposed examples of it, and in an unsatisfactory footnote sends the reader for verification of these, not to Jesuit authorities like Busenbaum, Layman, Ballerini or Bucceroni, but to shadowy excerpts from Jesuit writings in Mirbt's "*Quellen zur Geschichte des Papstums*." Even Jesuits, so long becudged by their enemies, must object to such summary treatment. Mr. Smith states that the Jesuits took account of everything but the conscience of mankind. Yet their moral teaching and asceticism have received the approval of Rome. In his strictures on the Order, Mr. Smith is the echo, unconscious perhaps, but none the less harsh and unpleasant, of the calumnies of Pascal.

Like most of the apologists of Luther, the author makes a great deal of his so-called sincerity. But if sincerity means a love of truth, a sense of fair play, a decent regard for the opinions of others, we fail to find it in the Reformer. He certainly flung it aside when approving the bigamy of Philip of Hesse and when corrupting and falsifying a text of St. Paul for his own ends. Selfish, proud, heartless in his dealing with the revolted peasants, hypocritical in his flattery of the great, Luther may dazzle, terrify. He also repels. What Gladstone said of Bismarck must be said of the apostate friar: He was a big, not a great man. He lacked moral earnestness. Neither he nor the Reformation have worked for the real good of humanity. They, as Santayana well says, moved away from the Gospel and attempted something like a return to German heathendom. If the German races accomplished anything for civilization, they did so not because Luther spurred them forth on the road of progress, but because the roots of national greatness had been implanted in their hearts by the older religion which he attempted to destroy. Although he recklessly swept away much of its work and impaired its influence, it still unconsciously energized in his people and left in them the seeds of their national greatness.

J. C. R.

Storia di Christo. GIOVANNI PAPINI. Seconda Edizione Riveduta. Vallecchi Editore Firenze. \$1.70.

To those who are not aware of the change of heart which came over Papini some years ago, the name of the author of this volume will recall only unpleasant associations: opposition to creeds of all kinds, especially to Christianity, and to Christ Himself. It is not, however, the iconoclast of old who writes this book, but a chastened and enlightened man, who sought truth through many devious ways and found it at last at the side of Christ. He is proud to sign himself, after the example of his beloved Florence, the subject and soldier of Christ. Having recognized the folly and the delusions of his former attitude toward the Divine Saviour, and being conscious that he had written things that were a travesty and a libel on the true character of the "Son of Man," he determined to make reparation. He testifies to an inner compulsion forcing him to dedicate the same literary power which was employed in the spread of error, to building up the truth. Knowing as he does the temper of mind of those who are outside the Church, he believed that he could write a life of Christ which would

meet their peculiar needs. And so he retired to solitude with scarcely any books but the Gospels, and the "*Storia di Christo*" is the result. It is just the kind of book we might expect, when written by such a man, under such circumstances and with such a purpose.

It has no scientific pretensions; it is weak on the patristic, theological and philosophical sides; it adds nothing to the knowledge of Christ of which the Church is already possessed. Its principal merit is the vivid setting the author gives to the main aspects of the human side of the Saviour, its grandeur, its heroism, its sublime self-sacrifice. He has unqualified admiration for the words and works of the God-Man, and he has set this down in brilliant and affectionate pen pictures, which are in sharp contrast with pages of burning scorn for the modern spirit which seeks to supplant the spirit of His Kingdom. But of the Divinity, which is repeatedly proclaimed in the course of the story, he catches only fugitive glimpses. It is this patent shortcoming of the book which makes the Catholic brought up in the Faith feel continually a vague sense of discontent while reading its pages. It is a rather faithful portrayal of Christ, as far as it goes, but it leaves unsaid so many household and familiar things about Our Lord, and these among the most important, or else slurs them over, that the final impression is distinctly disappointing. The book fails by being wholly inadequate. In explanation, however, of this manifest defect, it should be remembered that the story of Christ was written for those whom the author would have made the first steps into the Fold.

J. H. F.

Essays in Critical Realism. By DURANT DRAKE, ARTHUR LOVEJOY, JAMES BISSET PRATT, ARTHUR K. ROGERS, GEORGE SANTAYANA, ROY WOOD SELLARS, C. A. STRONG. New York: The Macmillan Co.

It is a decided pleasure to one in concord with the principles of scholastic philosophy, to find so eminent a group of American philosophers turning their footsteps at last towards the path of common sense. Perhaps, it would be too much to say that they are entirely in agreement with the schoolmen on the question of the nature of truth and its acquisition; but this much is certain, they have given over the follies of the idealist and the exaggerated realist and the weird ramblings of the pragmatist and are seeking the true solution some place between. That the scholastic doctrine on this point of epistemology has ever been the common-sense one, seems to have escaped their notice, as they do not hesitate to designate their find as something quite new, though it is founded upon the dictates of common sense. With the usual dexterity of the modern philosopher, Mr. Pratt, in his historical review of the point under discussion, which forms the beginning of the third essay of the collection, jumps, perhaps through ignorance, from the sayings of Plato and Aristotle on the subject, to the pronouncements of Descartes on the same problem. Had the writer been able to bring himself to the reading of such scholastics as Aquinas, Bellarmine and Suarez he would probably have found that critical realism is, after all, just an obscurely presented phase of a subject that was quite well understood by the schoolmen.

The difficulty of ascertaining the authors' exact meaning is threefold: they have decided to dispense with a common set of terms; their treatment is for the most part negative; they have essayed the impossible task of explaining away an epistemological difficulty without any reference to any other branch of philosophy. The first two difficulties may easily be eliminated by an agreement on terms and a few simple definitions. The third difficulty must stand as a permanent defect in the work until such time as the authors set down their understanding of the nature of the knowing faculty, without which a thorough treatment of the problem can never be had. Since the authors have evidently turned toward the schoolmen, let them go on,

and in the scholastic schools of logic and psychology they will find solutions for the points still cloudy in their work.

P. A. M.

Back to Methuselah. A Metabiological Pentateuch. By BERNARD SHAW. New York: Brentano's. \$2.25.

In his usual lengthy preface Mr. Shaw informs us that the plays in this volume develop a big idea, which has haunted him for a very long time. The big idea is this: The secret of human progress is creative evolution. It is a well-known fact that when an individual is driven to desperation he can by a super-human effort generate new potencies to meet hitherto insurmountable obstacles. Now, the average duration of human life is altogether too short and inadequate to advance the evolution of the race. We are making blunders all our life; and, just when we are beginning to learn something from our sad experiments, it is time to die. It is clear that nature intends us to gather all the forces of our will to overcome this weak-minded acquiescence in an early death at the age of eighty-five or ninety. There is no reason in the world why, with a little assertion of the will, we should not live to be gay young fellows of eight or nine hundred.

Mr. Shaw then proceeds to give dramatic expression to his engaging gospel. The first play in his "pentateuch" has its setting in Paradise, and the last is laid in the year A.D. 31,920. The other three occur at various periods between. In the last play men live forever, unless they are killed. They ought to be paragons of wisdom according to the philosophy of the preface. What do we see? Melancholy, pre-Raphaelite figures moving sadly in mountain glades: sometimes they sit and think: sometimes they sit only.

We hesitate to make any calculations as to how long Mr. Shaw would have to live before he could hope to reach at his present pace, a rational theory of the human origin and destiny. His efforts as a religion-maker place him below Robespierre, Auguste Comte, Frederic Harrison, and Mrs. Eddy. His new book is a curious instance of cleverness making bricks without straw. Mr. Shaw tells us how he routed in argument a Jesuit living at the Brompton Oratory in London. What was the Jesuit doing in that galley?

J. J. D.

BOOKS AND AUTHORS

Aesop in Verse.—Fifty of Aesop's fables are done into very good English verse by Oliver Herford and each fable has an accompanying picture, in his book called "The Herford Aesop." (Ginn). The book will be enjoyed by grownups as well as by children. "Aesop wrote what we call fables," C. H. Thurber says in the preface, "a fable being a story which cannot be true but which may teach a great truth. . . . You will like to read these fables and before you know it you will find that you have taken very pleasantly a dose of good common sense of which most of us need more than we ever get." The fables selected from the old Greek's collection leave a great many more that every reader will wish the author to bring out in another volume.

New Fiction.—"The Man, The Tiger and The Snake," by Ferdinand Reyher (Putnam's) is a story of big business with the over-worked triangle setting, a suicide settling the problem which of course is no problem. With a bad solution at the end of more than 200 pages there is as much interest-power and skill shown by the writer as can be found in the many formula stories that are printed in our cheap magazines.—Emma C. Dowd has written another "Polly" book. "When Polly Was Eighteen" (Houghton Mifflin, \$1.90) centers around a children's hospital and the heroine is wonderful in her love for children and her love for talk. The love that is supposed to interest the reader has an ending that is happy even if a great deal of unnecessary print delays the happiness. There is more merit in one page of the "Herford Aesop" than in all the pages con-

tained in these two specimens of new fiction.—Frank H. Spearman's latest story, "Laramie Holds the Range," (Scribners) is an exciting story of the West at the time when feuds were settled on private authority and violence was the order of the day. The story of how Jim Laramie held his own against his many enemies and finally won the love and hand of their chief, is told with the graphic skill that characterizes the author. The background is nature at its wildest, the characters are typical but drawn boldly, the book is clean and wholesome throughout, and there are thrills enough to satisfy even the most jaded imagination.—"The Flaming Forest" (Cosmopolitan, \$2.00), is another of James Oliver Curwood's stories of the mysterious Northland. It is a tale of love and romance, placid but with the hint of violence, carefully wrought out, simple yet baffling, working its way steadily through misunderstanding to peace and happiness. The book has subtle charm and artistic beauty. There are several pages that might better have been omitted and a suggestion of evil that in the end turns out to be false.

Spiritual Helps.—Many good people complain that in spite of their constant and multiplied acts of devotion, they find their spiritual life mechanical and without progress, and to meet their difficulties Father Joseph Sunn has written a little book of fifty pages, indicating simple ways of talking and walking with God. "In Touch with God" (Benziger, \$0.35) will be very helpful to those who wish to take the first steps toward a life of union with God.—In "Reading for the Workers" (Benziger) B. F. Page, S.J., has put in clear, succinct form some excellent counsels to encourage and guide workers in their reading, and to warn them against the danger of the indiscriminate use of books in public libraries. A series of classified lists of good books that can be procured at a nominal price is added as an appendix. The counsels and lists will be useful, not merely for workers, but for others as well.—"My Rosary or the Beads" (Winternach) is a booklet containing colored illustrations of each of the Mysteries of the Rosary, with a few words of explanation and an appropriate prayer printed opposite each picture. It will help children to understand the beauty and the meaning of the devotion which should form the very beginning be made a part of their daily lives.

For Chemistry Students.—Frederick C. Reeves' "Elementary Qualitative Analysis of the Metals and Acid Radicals: A Laboratory Manual" (New York, D. Van Nostrand Co. \$1.50) is intended for high-school students and college men who are taking their first course in chemical analysis. In a clear and orderly manner the author takes first each member of the group singly and describes the typical reactions by which the positive ions may be identified. Then the several members of the group are separated and finally a summary of the combined separation and identification is given for reference. The importance of the ionic theory is emphasized throughout the book, the ionic equation for every reaction being required of the student. The method employed demands of the student an intelligent knowledge of general chemistry and the experiments constitute an excellent review of that branch of science. But modern chemical analysis in order to be truly scientific must be based on and guided by the knowledge of the many great principles which have been discovered, such as that of chemical equilibrium, the mass-action law, that of oxidation and reduction, concentration of ions, solubility product, etc., and it is hard to understand how a mere high-school student can be well enough grounded in these principles to make an intelligent use of them.

Peeps at Many Lands.—The series of studies which Macmillan is publishing under the general title of "Peeps at Many Lands" should prove both instructive and interesting for young people. Each volume contains descriptions of two countries, as they

are today. Customs, manners, cities, people, amusements, occupations, birds and beasts, the beauty of the country and similar topics are treated in a familiar style, with the purpose of giving a general impression rather than detailed information. The following volumes have just come from the press: Australia and New Zealand, by Frank Fox and P. A. Vaile; China and Japan, by Lena E. Johnston and John Finnemore; Italy and Greece, by John Finnemore and Edith A. Browne; Norway and Denmark, by A. F. Mockler-Ferryman and M. Pearson Thomson. Each volume has sixteen full-page illustrations in color, carefully selected to convey accurate impressions of the people and their country. These pictures are good and, though somewhat highly colored, give a fair idea of life in these lands at the present day. It is to be regretted that the names of the artists are not mentioned except on the plates themselves, where they are hardly legible. The question of religion is scarcely touched on.

Lourdes.—"The Story of Lourdes" (Herder, \$1.50), by Rose Lynch, is an enthusiastic Irish woman's descriptions of the marvels she witnessed at Our Lady's shrine during the national pilgrimage of her countrymen in 1913 together with a good account of the apparitions Bernadette beheld and of the wonderful growth of the world-wide devotion to Our Lady of Lourdes. The author spent six months at the shrine, frequently interviewed Bernadette's brother, and her old teacher, Mother Marie, her fellow-novice Mother Theresa and Dr. Cox, the English physician who has devoted his life to the work of the Lourdes medical bureau. It is hard to see how any unbiased mind that reads attentively such a book as this or Father Clifford's very convincing "The Logic of Lourdes" (America Press, \$1.00) can escape the conviction that miracles quite as remarkable as those we read of in the Gospel are taking place today in France. Miss Lynch's book is full of good photographs.

For Contemplatives.—Father Benedict Williamson is a convert English priest who has given spiritual conferences to the Nuns of the Perpetual Adoration at Tyburn Convent, built on the site of the gallows where so many martyrs died in the sixteenth century. These discourses he has now brought together in a book called "Supernatural Mysticism" (Herder, \$2.75) and containing twenty-seven conferences bearing on the life of enclosed nuns. The author begins with a sermon on the contemplative's high vocation, then shows the means by which it is attained, describes the purpose and nature of prayer and, with St. Teresa and St. John of the Cross as guides, explains the higher forms of prayer. Then follow chapters on the religious state, the nun's failings, the perfection of the contemplative's calling and how to reach it. Speaking of the lamentable defection of so many religious houses in the days of Henry VIII, Father Williamson well remarks that they fell away.

Not because they were sinks of iniquity, as some pretend, but because the world-spirit had got in, and in many cases they were only collections of eminently respectable people engaged in literary and scientific pursuits. They had lost their supernatural side and had become gradually sapped and enfeebled, until they had descended to the purely natural level, so that when it became a question of being hung up by the neck on the gallows . . . they took a pension instead.

As the author was a chaplain in the Great War he is able to enforce his arguments for the contemplative's life of self-immolation by many examples derived from his experience at the front.

Social Literature.—An excellent summary of the social problem in our own country is given by Dr. John A. Ryan and the Rev.

R. A. McGowan in "A Catechism of the Social Question," printed by the Paulist Press for the Social Department of the National Catholic Welfare Council. The catechetical method is doubtless the briefest and clearest way of explaining a difficult subject like the one under discussion. The social question is studied in its sources, its "ineffective" and "effective" solutions. —Three interesting pamphlets issued by the Volksvereins-Verlag of M. Gladbach should also be mentioned here: "Socialism" (Mark, 1.80), by Dr. Ludwig Nieder, is a rather complete exposition of the various headings under which "scientific" Socialism is found wanting. The author makes clear why it must be condemned both from an economic and a religious point of view. "Ein Staatsbürgerbüchlein auf Grund unserer Reichsverfassung" (Mark, 4.50), by Anton Mackes, is a book of civics "for the school and home." It is based upon the new German Constitution. "Neue Ziele der Sozialversicherung" (Mark, 2.50), finally, is a booklet by the president of the German State Insurance Department, Dr. Paul Kaufmann, who outlines the new aims which he believes should be followed in the policy of State insurance. He hopes that in the future, as in the past, Germany may be "the mistress teaching the entire civilized world her lessons of social insurance."

BOOKS RECEIVED

- Benziger Bros., New York:**
Our Lord's Own Words. By Rt. Rev. Abbot Smith, O.S.B. \$1.75;
Reading for the Workers. By B. F. Page, S.J. \$0.35; In Touch with
God. By Rev. Joseph Sunn. \$0.35; A Life's Oblation, the Biography
of Genevieve Hennef de Goutel. Preface by C. C. Martindale, S.J. \$2.00.
- Editions Bossard, Paris:**
Les Problèmes Internationaux et le Congrès de la Paix. A. Lugan.
- George H. Doran Co., New York:**
One-Third Off. By Irvin S. Cobb. \$1.00; Bill Boram. By Robert
Norwood. \$1.50; Dodo Wonders. By E. F. Benson. \$1.90.
- Doubleday, Page & Co., New York:**
Her Father's Daughter. By Gene Stratton Porter. \$1.75; The Beloved
Woman. By Kathleen Norris. \$1.75.
- Ginn & Co., Boston:**
The Herford Aesop, Fifty Fables in Verse. By Oliver Herford.
- Peter Golden, 137 East 25th St., New York:**
The Voice of Ireland. By Peter Golden.
- B. Herder Book Co., St. Louis:**
Supernatural Mysticism. By Benedict Williamson. \$2.75; In the Days
of Owen Roe. A Story of the Great Catholic Rebellion of 1641. By
James Murphy. \$2.00; The Story of Lourdes. By Rose Lynch. \$1.60;
Dante's Mystic Love. By Marianne Kavanagh. \$1.50.
- Houghton Mifflin Co., Boston:**
Social Decay and Regeneration. By R. Austin Freeman. \$5.00; When
Polly Was Eighteen. By Emma C. Dowd. \$1.90.
- John Lane Co., New York:**
An African Adventure. By Isaac F. Marcossan. Ireland Unfreed.
Poems of 1921. By Sir William Watson.
- Loyola University Press, Chicago:**
Apologetica Quam in Usam Auditorum Suorum Concinnavit Joannes
T. Langan, S.J. \$3.50; The Laws of Thought or Formal Logic; Funda-
mental Ethics. Both by William Poland, S.J. \$1.00 each.
- The Macmillan Co., New York:**
An Outline of Modern History: a Syllabus with Map-Studies. By
Edward Mead Earle, M.A.; The Social Mission of Charity, a Study of
Points of View in Catholic Charities. By William J. Kirby, Ph.D.,
LL.D. \$2.25; The Foundation of Modern Ireland. By Constantia
Maxwell, M.A.; The Word of God. By Mgr. Francis Borgangini-Duca.
Introduction by Most Rev. John Bonzano. \$2.00; Peeps at Many
Lands: Norway and Denmark. By Lieut. Col. A. F. Mockler-Ferryman
and M. Pearson Thomson; China and Japan. By Lena Johnson and
John Finnemore; Italy and Greece. By John Finnemore and Edith A.
Browne; Australia and New Zealand. By Frank Fox and P. A. Vaile.
- The Marlier Publishing Co., Boston:**
Acadie Reconstitution d'un Chapitre Perdu de L'Histoire D'Amerique.
Ouvrage publié d'après le MS. original, entièrement refondu, corrigé,
annoté, mis au point des recherches les plus récentes, avec une Intro-
duction et des Appendices. Tome Troisième. La Déportation et Au-
delà. Par Henri D'Arles.
- München-Regensburg, Verlagsanstalt vorm. G. J. Manz:**
Geschichte der Jesuiten in den Ländern deutscher Zunge. Von Bern-
hard Duhr, S.J.
- The Paulist Press, New York:**
Manuel of Christian Perfection. By Mgr. P. J. Stockman.
- Plon-Nourrit & Cie, Paris:**
L'Irlande Insurgée. Par Sylvain Briollay. 4 fr.
- Procure Générale, Paris:**
Un Précurseur du Bolchevisme, Francisco Ferrer. A. Lugan.
- G. P. Putnam's Sons, New York:**
The Glass of Fashion, Some Social Reflections with Portraits. \$2.50;
The Man, the Tiger, and the Snake. By Ferdinand Reyher. \$1.75;
The Leper's Bell. By Massicks Sparroy. \$1.75.
- A. Tralin, Paris:**
Balmes. A. Lugan.
- Artemas Ward, New York:**
The Life of Artemas Ward. By Charles Martyn. \$3.00.
- John W. Winterich, Columbus:**
The Apocalypse of St. John. By Rev. E. Sylvester Berry. \$1.50; My
Rosary or The Beads. \$0.10.

EDUCATION

Your Child and the Catholic School

THE canon law states in simple and unmistakable terms that all parents are bound by a most grave obligation to provide for the religious education of their children.

1113. Parents are bound by a most grave obligation to provide to the best of their ability for the religious and moral as well as for the physical and civil education of their children, and for their temporal well-being.

A grave obligation binds under mortal sin. The determination to avoid an obligation so binding, when it can be fulfilled, debars from the Sacraments. Consequently, parents who refuse to provide to the best of their ability for the moral and religious education of their children, cannot be admitted to the Sacraments. And in view of existing circumstances in this age and country, it is practically impossible for parents to provide for the moral and religious education of their children, in the sense of canon 1113, unless the children are placed in a Catholic school. Hence after the definite provisions for this training, stated in canons 1372 and 1373, it is decreed in canon 1374:

Catholic children must not attend non-Catholic, neutral or mixed schools, that is, such as are also open to non-Catholics. It is for the Bishop of the place alone to decide, according to the instructions of the Apostolic See, in what circumstances and with what precautions, attendance at such schools may be tolerated, without danger of perversion to the pupils.

This is the law for the universal Church. Because of the public-school system, it is particularly pertinent in this country.

THE CHILD IN A NON-CATHOLIC SCHOOL

THERE are apparent exceptions. But these increase rather than diminish the responsibilities of the parent, described in canon 1113. If no Catholic school exists in a given locality, and parents are not able to make other arrangements, the child may be enrolled in a non-Catholic school. In this case, the burden of providing for the child's religious education is thrown almost entirely upon father and mother. The child may not be permitted to possess, still less to use, textbooks which contain teachings contrary to faith or morals. Parents, therefore, rest under a grave obligation to examine these texts. If the texts are offensive, and if the authorities refuse to change them, the child must be withdrawn. This obligation to withdraw the child is even more pressing, should the personal character of the teachers be objectionable, should they inculcate principles or advise practices contrary to Faith or morals, or should the companionship of the pupils be found unwholesome for a Catholic child. Are the majority of Catholic parents capable of making this examination? Can they exorcize the anti-Catholic tone and spirit often found in these schools? Yet they are bound in conscience to ascertain that nothing in the non-Catholic school is hurtful to the Faith or morals of their children.

PARENTAL DUTY IN THIS CASE

THIS, however, is but the beginning of parental duty towards a child in a non-Catholic school. After first making sure that the school is not positively harmful—for no school which divorces religion from education can be approved by a Catholic—parents are obliged actively to provide for religious instruction at home. It is supposed, of course, that the Bishop has been consulted. "Religious instruction" does not simply mean that the child must be taken to Mass on Sundays and holy days of obligation. A religious education implies regular and careful instruction in the truths of revealed religion, none excepted. The child must be made to know and according to his capacity, to understand, his duties to God, to his neighbor and to himself. The syllabus of any adequate religious course is long and intricate. The child must be taught, not left to pick up scraps of information from example only or from a chance word. He must be trained in the practise of religion; he must be so in-

structed that, as far as diligence, knowledge and good will on part of his parents can secure the result, he will become all that is meant by the term "a practical Catholic."

Is this easy? How many Catholic fathers and mothers can spare the time for careful, intelligent, systematic religious instruction? Granting that they know their religion, how many have the teacher's ability to impart what they know? For knowledge is but one part of the teacher's equipment, and a man as wise as Solomon may be an abject failure as a teacher. Yet, unless they entrust their children to a Catholic school, all Catholic parents are obliged, under pain of mortal sin, to furnish an equivalent training. True, to genuine good will God will supply what is wanting, but only a miracle of grace can supply for the lack of a training in a Catholic school. Instruction in a Sunday school alone, or occasionally after school hours, is not enough. In the abstract it is possible to provide adequately for the child's religious instruction at home. Practically, however, this is rarely possible, and for the reasons given above.

SOUL-MURDER

BUT for the Catholic father who, without episcopal sanction, sends his child to the public school, when he could enter him at a Catholic institution, there is no excuse in heaven or on earth. He has begun the career of Herod; it will be no fault of his if he is not guilty of soul-murder. Let the Catholic father whose child is in the non-Catholic school, or who is minded to place him there, commune with his conscience. The day will come, perhaps very soon, when God will require these children at his hands. Is he willing to stand before the Eternal Judge in the day of his great assizes, with this plea: "I might have sent my children to a Catholic school, but because I had money and position, I sent them to the non-Catholic school. I might have put them under the charge of consecrated men and women who taught that the first duty of every human being was to know, love and serve Almighty God. But I gave them to teachers who dared not assert that an adorable God even existed. I might have brought them to halls in which every head was bowed in silent reverential adoration at the very mention of the Name of Jesus. But I took them to schools from which the Saviour of the world would have been excluded, had He entered to teach His doctrine of humble, unwavering acceptance of Him, and of service and love. I knew the plain law of the Church, and I disobeyed it. I might have given good example, but I scandalized my weaker brethren by inducing them to follow where I had led. I knew what my duty was, but I was deaf to the warning and to the pleading of those set to rule me in God's place. I consulted my own desires, and I laughed at authority, and I said that the Catholic school was no place for the children of a family so refined and cultured, of a father so wealthy and influential as myself."

THE TEST OF PRACTICAL FAITH

DARE any Catholic enter that plea before the judgment-seat of an omniscient and omnipotent God? If not, let him not file it in time by sending his children to a non-Catholic school. Let him not call himself a practical Catholic because he goes to Mass on Sundays, and to the Sacraments occasionally, but for five days a week entrusts his children to a system which the Church forbids him to approve. Let the test of his practical acceptance of the teachings of the Catholic Church be made in this question, "Are his children in a Catholic school." For the man who sends his children to the public school when he could obtain for them the blessings of a Catholic education is not a practising Catholic, even though he goes to Mass every morning, and by his silence touching the necessary matter in Confession, is absolved every night.

Assuredly, God will hold the Catholic parent responsible for his fulfilment of this most serious obligation to secure for his children to the best of his ability a moral and religious education.

If he can do this while sending his children to a non-Catholic school, well and good, provided the Bishop gives his approval. But in not one case in a million can he secure, without the aid of a Catholic school, the training which the law makes imperative. God has given these children into his keeping, and how can he answer for them, unless he places them in a Catholic school?

In these evil days the world has risen up against God and His Christ; in philosophy, in science, in literature, in the marketplace, in the amusements of the people, above all, in the school. In God's dear name, let Catholics at least, be willing to suffer inconvenience, loss, even obloquy, that their little ones, redeemed by the Precious Blood of the Son of God, may be brought to the Heart of Christ through the sure portals of a Catholic school.

PAUL L. BLAKELY, S.J.

SOCIOLOGY

The "Civilizing" Motor-Car

"WHAT a marvelous promotor of civilization the automobile has proved to be!" the Unreflecting Optimist enthusiastically exclaimed as he sat one summer evening on his piazza with his friend the Thoughtful Pessimist and watched the two unceasing streams of motor-cars appear and vanish over the rise in the busy road that ran by his home.

"A 'promoter of civilization,' did you say?" asked the Thoughtful Pessimist, puffing savagely at a cigar. "Of course you mean 'retarder.'"

"Why, no," mildly answered the Unreflecting Optimist. "I really meant 'promoter.' I regard Henry Ford as one of the great benefactors of mankind. Think of all the happiness his low-priced car has brought to millions and millions of men and women. To cite but one instance, consider the wife of the Western farmer. It is said that the loneliness and monotony of her life on the prairie used to drive the poor woman stark mad. But the wide diffusion of the automobile has enabled her to visit her neighbors or ride occasionally to the nearest town and thus keep well-balanced and cheerful."

"I dare say," grunted the Thoughtful Pessimist. "It wonderfully develops your prairie wife's intellect, no doubt, to leave her peaceful farmhouse and wildly dash to a village forty miles away, there to gaze for hours and hours at silly moving pictures."

"You are too hard on the poor woman," protested the U. O. "Her chief needs are change of scene, human society and the amenities of civilization, and these the auto gives her. So 'Long live Henry Ford!' say I."

WHAT IS CIVILIZATION?

"WHAT do you mean by 'civilization,' anyway?" the T. P. asked.

"Why, advancement in knowledge, refinement and the arts, of course. The multiplication of the means of culture and enjoyment, progress and enlightenment; the uplifting of men and women mentally, morally and socially."

"Good!" assented the T. P. "But you do not seriously believe that the motor-car has notably promoted any of those worthy ends, do you?"

"To be sure I do," answered the U. O. "To improve the general health of the people is to increase human happiness, and you must admit that their daily spin in the air and sunshine does help to keep autoists 'fit.' Moreover, touring broadens and enriches their minds and the social and cultural advantages of automobile travel must be obvious even to a pessimist like you."

"Humph!" growled the T. P. (That at least is the conventional way of spelling the sound he emitted, but the noise he made cannot, of course, be euphonically expressed with accuracy.) "How many people who would get from the use of the

automobile the benefits you mention really have a car at all? How often do those who swelter in the crowded tenements of our cities get an auto ride? No, their money goes for high rents, meager food and indispensable clothing."

"As yet, unfortunately, every American family has not been able to buy an auto. But give us time. I predict that fifty years from now the use of the motor-car will be practically universal in this country. Just think how high the public health average will then be."

DOES THE AUTO INCREASE LONGEVITY?

"I HAVE not observed that the auto has perceptibly increased the longevity of the citizens of New York State. Only last month the motor-car brought violent deaths to 165 people in this commonwealth, and I dare say that is a rather low average. One of the benefits of civilization, I believe, is supposed to be security of life and limb. A 'marvelous promotor of civilization' indeed!"

"But you must admit that the motor-car by providing cheap and convenient transportation facilities, has delivered thousands and thousands from the narrowing influence of their environment and shown them how varied and beautiful the wide world is."

"Perhaps it has opened some fossilized minds a little," grudgingly owned the T. P. "But at what a cost! Who reads a book, and especially a serious book, nowadays? Isn't the motor-car largely to blame for that? Men and women who were content formerly to sit quietly at home occupied with profitable reading, now devote all their leisure to whirling through dust clouds in an auto."

"But they read fair nature's book, which is far better," murmured the U. O.

"Nonsense!" snorted the T. P. "Most of my touring friends seem to see nothing but the road they devour and remember nothing but the number of miles they have covered. Indeed I have regretfully observed in confirmed autoists a steady deterioration of character. But what else could you expect? How can a man who tears madly through the country, constantly menacing human life, practise meekness? What love of lowliness, I'd like to know, can dwell in the heart of arrogant autoists whose only joy is breaking speed laws and evading traffic regulations?"

"There is something in that," agreed the U. O. "Generosity, too, seems a very difficult virtue for the autoist to practise. I have known a man, formerly very charitable, who has not a cent now to give his St. Vincent de Paul conference. He says he needs all his money for tires and gasoline."

FRAUDS AND MALTHUSIANS

"IT'S much worse than that. Men hitherto thrifty and provident now mortgage their homes, starve their families and keep their creditors waiting in order that they may get money enough to buy and maintain an expensive automobile. I am acquainted with professional men, artisans, and tradesmen, who once enjoyed a wide repute for sterling honesty but are now exceedingly given to overreaching, overcharging and other sharp practises. You see they must keep up their motor-cars at any price. And how many autoists of your acquaintance have large families; nay, any children at all? The selfish creatures thoroughly realize that they cannot have motor-cars and babies, too, so the latter are no longer welcome. The practise of fraud and race-suicide are hardly the marks of a high civilization. And what a convenient purveyor of illicit 'hooch' the auto has lately become!"

"Consider, too, the lamentable state of manners and morals nowadays," the Thoughtful Pessimist went on. "Hasn't the automobile become the instrument or occasion of many deeds of wickedness which could not be committed easily without it?"

Just run through the crimes of robbery, debauchery and violence in the papers of a single day throughout the world and observe how numerous are the instances in which a motor-car figures in them. It seems to be absolutely indispensable now for the successful gunman, burglar and hold-up man. Did you notice whether the sum-total of automobiles stolen in New York alone last week was 150 or 200? The weekly toll seems to be steadily rising. And you must admit that the automobile immeasurably increased the carnage and destruction of the World War."

"That's true. It was largely due to their tanks that the Allies won, I am told. But we must not forget that the auto-ambulance helped to save the lives of many a wounded soldier."

VERITABLE DEVIL WAGONS

"THAT I grant. But do you know of any vehicle that better deserves to be called a 'devil wagon' than the night-prowling taxi or the 'moonlight' touring car? It is doubtful whether there is any graver menace to the purity of womanhood than the automobile has become of late years. Following the war the general repeal of the old conventions, which were wisely designed for the protection of young people, helped to make the automobile an instrument of sin. How many youths and maidens, do you suppose, have gone to the dogs in a motor-car during the past ten years? If the effective safeguarding of womanly virtue is a striking characteristic of Christian civilization, your boasted automobile does not appear to be an instrument of true progress, does it?"

"On the other hand," retorted the U. O., "who can reckon up all the good that the motor-car has enabled the country priest to do, by helping him to keep in close touch with his widely-scattered flock. How much easier he must now find it to reach his outlying missions for Mass and confession. Then think of all the quick relief the country doctor's auto has enabled him to bring to the sick and suffering. And without our giant tractors I do not see how the Western prairies could be forced to yield the food with which the world is fed."

"All that must be granted, I suppose," assented the T. P., gloomily. But did you ever compute what a lamentable waste of time the motor-car occasions?"

"Waste of time! Absurd! Why, its time-saving quality is the automobile's chiefest glory."

IS THE AUTO A TIME-SAVER?

"I ADMIT that autoists move very rapidly from place to place. But what do they do with all the valuable time that they thus save? Is it passed in beautifying and strengthening the character, or in improving and cultivating the mind? I gravely doubt it. The confirmed autoist, as far as he has come under my observation, is generally the unabashed slave of sybaritic self-indulgence. He rides when he should walk, feasts when he should fast, spends when he should save, gossips when he should read, idles when he should work, and sleeps when he should pray. He drives to the golf links rather than to church, misses Mass rather than lose a half-hour of his Sunday auto-tour, and more often than not, contracts extravagant and unhygienic habits of living that bring him at last to bankruptcy, the operating table and an untimely grave."

"What a doleful Jeremiad you have composed on the evils of the motor-car, to be sure! Cheer up, old Pessimist. After all, it is not such an unmitigated curse as you think. Tomorrow I am going to take three auto-bus loads of Sister Benigna's little orphans out for a day on the beach. I wish you would come along and help me entertain them. And now, it is such a fine evening let's take a spin in my new Packford. Come!"

"To be strictly consistent I should of course indignantly refuse your well-meant invitation," remarked the T. P. with a sigh. "But unfortunately I have always been a man far worse than

my principles. Besides I have an extraordinary devotion to St. Christopher, as you are well aware, and the most practical way there is, in my opinion, of showing my unbounded confidence in his heavenly protection is to ride in a motor-car with you at the wheel. So I shall have to go along with you, I suppose."

GEORGE DURHAM.

NOTE AND COMMENT

The Prohibition Crime Wave

AN increase of 800 per cent in the criminal court business since 1912 has been largely the result of Prohibition laws. Such, according to a special despatch to the New York *Herald*, was the statement made by Attorney-General Daugherty in urging upon the President and Congress the creation of eighteen new Federal court judgeships at large as the most practical and economical method of clearing the dockets of accumulated litigation over the entire country. The *Herald* further makes the startling revelation that there are now 141,000 cases pending in the Federal courts of the United States, an increase of 22,256 cases since last year.

No National "Drive" by K. of C.

FRAUDULENT attempts have been made to collect funds for the various activities in which the K. of C. have recently engaged. The fact is that no national money "drive" will be conducted by the Knights. Supreme Secretary William J. McGinley expressly states that:

The \$1,000,000 campaign of the K. of C. for the introduction of American welfare work into Italy at the request of Pope Benedict XV will be conducted solely among the 800,000 members of the Knights of Columbus. We shall not ask the general public to contribute a cent to this fund, as it is a K. of C. undertaking for foreigners in a foreign country. It has the broader aspect of being, in some small measure, a payment of the debt America owes Columbus.

The only drives the K. of C. will conduct in their name are campaigns for purely local works by local bodies of the organization, such as the campaign for a \$2,000,000 social service headquarters by the Knights of Columbus in New York, and campaigns for similar purposes in Boston, Philadelphia and other cities where such service is necessary to the community.

They desire, in particular, to warn the public that no one is authorized to make general solicitation for the Italian project. Not only are the Knights able to finance this undertaking without external aid, but the funds for the K. of C. educational, hospitalization, and American-history work are also in hand.

Ignoring the Church

IN a recent speech at Derby Mr. Hilaire Belloc, according to the *Salford Catholic Federationist*, expressed his belief that England was the only one of the great civilized European countries in which an educated man could make grotesque mistakes about the Catholic Church, its attitude, its doctrine and its growth. What he objected to in particular was the boycott against the Church by people in universities, pretending it did not exist. England, unfortunately, is not a solitary example of this state of wilful ignorance. He could get £5,000, he said, for writing a book about any subject, "except when it came to writing the point of view of a Catholic." Again, he would find that America does not differ from England in this respect. "I once astonished the House of Commons," he added, "by saying that Catholics would rather have their sons speaking with a vulgar accent and possessing bad manners than that they should lose the Faith. They thought I was mad, and if I had said that we preferred the Faith to money they would have thought that I was raving mad—but I did not go so far as that."

Central Society Champions Parish Schools

AT its sixty-fifth annual convention, held at Fort Wayne, Ind., the Central Society again strongly placed itself upon record for its defense of the parish schools.

The vast amount of good accomplished by the parochial schools is admitted by every close observer; the American citizens of Catholic faith should take a just pride in their educational achievements which stand before the world as a great patriotic deed. For the maintenance of the State schools the Catholics pay their full share of taxes just as well as their fellow-citizens of other creeds or no creed at all. As free American citizens, fully conscious of their rights and in compliance with their parental duties, the Catholics have voluntarily assumed the burden of building up and maintaining the parochial schools, and the least they expect from the State is protection against the unjust aggressions of such as in defiance of right reason would dare to try to rob them of the schools which are theirs by every title of the rights of nature and American citizenship.

The Smith-Towner, now Sterling-Towner bill, is again roundly condemned as inevitably leading to the curtailment of the rights of parents and of the rights of separate States and cities in the matter of education. The same reasons are also given for the rejection of the Sheppard-Towner bill, with the sound explanation:

We do not ignore the importance of protection of motherhood as a social problem, but we insist that it must rather be solved by means of self-help and mutual help, seconded by such aid from the individual States and the separate communities as conditions render necessary.

The Central Society has from first to last been nobly consistent in its fearless championship of our parish schools no less than in its advocacy of social measures and deserves for this the gratitude of every American Catholic.

An Answer to the Klan

SCORES of citizens of Waco, Texas, have signed a petition denouncing the activities of the Ku Klux Klan, whose outrages, according to the *Houston Chronicle*, were "nearly up to the century mark" by the end of last July. The petition, in part, reads:

We, the undersigned citizens of McClellan County, adhere to the principles of constitutional government, as ordained and established by our forefathers, and believe in the inviolability of the bill of rights, both State and Federal, and maintain that all criminal laws should be enforced through the duly organized courts, administered by the constituted authorities, and we are unalterably opposed to the practices of the present-day Ku Klux Klan, and declare that it is subversive of constitutional government and civil liberty and we pledge our moral support to our officers in their effort to protect citizens against the unlawful violence of such organizations.

It is a sad commentary on representative government that an organization un-American in principle and method should be in a position to assure "all law-abiding citizens that they have nothing to fear." By what right has any organization to make of itself a fourth arm of government?

The Pope and the Bible

PROTESTANTS who still cling to the once popular myth that "Roman Catholics" abhor the Bible must have been startled at the interest shown in the Cambridge Bible Congress. Here are a few additional facts given by the *London Universe* which it may be worth remembering:

It was more than satisfying to learn from Cardinal Gasquet that his Holiness had rendered "substantial financial assistance" to the Revision Commission; and now, as a further proof of the Pope's interest in the spread of the "written word," we have from the same unimpeachable authority the following illuminating facts: The *Pia Società*

di San Giralomo have been issuing an edition of the Gospels and the Acts for one lira (normally tenpence), but the price of printing and paper has increased so much that it was found that each volume was costing 1 lira 65 (about 1s. 7½d.). His Eminence asked the Pope for directions. "The price must remain at one lira," was the reply, "and I will pay the difference." And when the next edition of the Gospels was on the *tapis* his Holiness paid 92,000 lire for the purchase of the necessary paper—that sum representing the difference between the cost of production and the selling price. These instances are valuable points for Catholics when next they hear the gibe so often on Protestant lips: "You Catholics care nothing for the Bible."

It is well, also, in this connection to recall the words of the present Holy Father when writing to Cardinal Bourne, March 2, 1915, to commend in a special way the diligence shown by the Catholic Truth Society in spreading copies of the Holy Gospels and of other books of the Holy Scriptures:

The work of opening a way into every Catholic household for the books of the Holy Gospel is one to which assuredly the highest possible praise is due, for thus, as we see, are made known the words of life which tell of all that was said and done by God our Saviour, to the end that men, by faithfully giving heed to them as to a light shining in a dark place, may be led nearer to the true Light of our souls and aroused to follow Him more closely.

English Catholics feel particularly grateful for the fair and kindly manner in which the secular press gave publicity to the doings of the Cambridge Congress.

The N. C. W. C. on the "Little Flower"

IT is hardly an exaggeration to say that few ecclesiastical events could arouse the universal interest that will be caused by the simple announcement that another step has been taken towards the beatification of Sister Teresa of the Child Jesus, known as the "Little Flower." On August 14 Pope Benedict XV, solemnly declared her "Venerable." On June 9, 1914 Pope Pius X had previously signed with his own hand the commission introducing her cause at Rome. Yet had she lived to this day she would be only in her forty-eighth year. The news service of the N. C. W. C. says of her on the present occasion:

Within two or three years of her death her biography had been translated into many languages and had passed through innumerable editions. From all parts of the world, from the centers of civilization as well as from remote missionary stations in Africa, China, the South Sea Islands, the West Indies, and from all over the world, thousands of letters began to pour into the Carmelite Monastery at Lisieux describing the prodigious miracles, or apparent miracles, visions, cures, and spiritual favors which had been obtained by thousands through prayers directed through the intercession of Sister Teresa. She who in life had been completely hidden, absolutely unknown outside her cloistered community, began to exercise an influence over others such as can only be compared to the influence of a St. Francis, a St. Ignatius or a St. Teresa. No more remarkable manifestation of Catholic faith and employment of the supernatural graces of the Church has been known in modern times. The great missionary diocese of Alaska was placed under her special protection. The same thing was done in the case of the mission for the conversion of Wales. Countless Catholic institutions throughout the world made Sister Teresa their patroness. So great have been the number of apparent miracles, or striking instances of spiritual favors attributed to the power of Sister Teresa, that a special magazine was published merely to record these events. Bound numbers of these magazines constitute several thick volumes.

So her words are being fulfilled that she would spend her heaven in doing good on earth, and we may well believe that her great mission here has but begun. "You will look down upon us from heaven, will you not?" some one asked her shortly before her death. "No," she replied in her unhesitating way, "I will come down."